

THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

An Investigation into the Exchange of Artistic Motifs  
between the Aegean, Egypt, and the Near East  
in the Bronze Age

by

J.L. CROWLEY B.A.(Hons.)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA

HOBART

1977

THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

VOLUME I                      TEXT

VOLUME II                    PLATES

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university nor does it include any copy or paraphrase of material previously published or written by another person except when due reference is made in the text.

Signed:

*J. L. Crowley*

Date:

*December, 1977.*

THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>VOLUME I</u>	<u>TEXT</u>
<u>VOLUME II</u>	<u>PLATES</u>

THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

VOLUME I TEXT

*Contents*

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	(i)
LIBRARY ABSTRACT - Summary of the Thesis	(ii)
ABBREVIATIONS	(iv)

*Introduction*

1.	INTRODUCTION AND CHRONOLOGY	1
----	-----------------------------	---

*Part I The Motifs*

2.	MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST	
	Heraldic Poses	15
	Antithetical Group	23
	Mirror Reverse	27
	Contest Scenes, Struggling Hero, and Master of Animals	30
	Mistress of Animals	35
	Sphinx	41
	Griffin	47
	Dragons and Crocodiles	55
	Thoueris and the Minoan Genius	59
	Sacred Tree, Sacred Pillar	65
	Palm, Palmette	72
	Papyrus, Lotus	76
	Rosette	83
	Quatrefoil	89
	Scale Pattern	92
	Guilloche, Linked Circles, Quirk	95
	Spiral	100
	Flying Gallop	107



		<u>Page</u>
3.	OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART	
	Smiting Figure, Pharaoh and Weather God	113
	Star Disk in Crescent	116
	Winged Sun Disk	119
	Scale Mountain	120
	Duel	121
	Bull Sports	124
	Fish, Dolphin, Octopus, Nautilus	126
	Tricurved Arch	128
	Rocky Landscape, Glen	129
	Marbling, Colour Waves	130
4.	AEGEAN AND EASTERN ARTISTIC CONVENTIONS AND THEMES	
	The Human Figure	132
	Borders	140
	War, Hunt and the Chariot	142
	Ritual and the Gods	146
	Animals, Bucrania	148
	Ships	154
	<i>Part II The Artistic Issues</i>	
5.	THE QUESTION OF ARTISTIC EXCHANGE	
	Indigenous Creation and Motif Transference	156
	The International Repertoire	169
6.	THE FOREIGN MOTIF IN THE INDIGENOUS STYLE	
	The Intrusive Element	181
	The Incorporated Element	185
	National Styles	189
7.	THE INTERNATIONAL STYLE	
	Ornate and Severe	196
	The Classification of Individual Pieces	206

	<u>Page</u>
8. MEANS OF TRANSFERENCE	
The Direct Import	222
The Skill of the Craftsman	226
Mobility of the Personnel	230
Royal Prerogative	240
9. THE ACCEPTANCE AND REJECTION OF MOTIFS	
Aegean Attitudes	245
<i>Conclusion</i>	
10. SUMMARY OF RESULTS	261
BIBLIOGRAPHY	271

THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

VOLUME II PLATES

*Contents*

	<u>Page</u>
1. PLATES	
Notes on the Plates and Plate List	1
List of Plates	3
Plates 1 - 544	51
2. CONCORDANCE OF SITES AND PLATES	156
3. CONCORDANCE OF MOTIFS IN AEGEAN GLYPTIC	
Notes on the Compilation	159
Concordance	160
4. MAPS	
MAP 1. The Aegean, Egypt, and the Near East	165
MAP 2. Interconnections c1850 to c1750	166
MAP 3. Interconnections c1600 to c1500	167
MAP 4. Distribution of Minoan and Mycenaean Pottery and Objects in the East	168

THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

VOLUME I TEXT

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have to thank first the South Australian Branch of the Australian Federation of University Women for the award of the Jean Gilmore Bursary which helped make possible my first trip to Greece in 1973. Next I must thank the University of Tasmania for Study Leave in 1976 in which I again visited Greece and consolidated much of the Minoan and Mycenaean material I had been researching, as well as visiting most of the major European museums where much of the material treated in this thesis is displayed.

A special tribute must be paid to the British School of Archaeology in Athens for their warm welcome and help on both occasions when I was in Greece. I am sure they do not realize the extent of the debt that scholars from far countries owe to the British School.

My appreciation is also due to the many people who have encouraged me, my colleagues at work and my friends at home. I would wish to mention my special thanks to Professor Homer Thompson and Dorothy Burr Thompson for their encouragement to continue with the topic and to visit Greece as soon as possible. There must be a great number of people who, like myself, have come to Greece and benefitted from their welcome, their practical suggestions, and above all from their immense enthusiasm for all scholarship in all fields of ancient studies. I must also express my warmest thanks to my two supervisors: to Mr. R. G. Hood for his patient reading of the drafts and for his challenging questions; to Professor P.R.C. Weaver for his comments as the work progressed and for his quiet confidence that the thesis would surely be completed.

Finally I must thank my family, without whose support the thesis could not have been written.

December 1977

Hobart.

## LIBRARY ABSTRACT

### Summary of the Thesis

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the artistic phenomenon that, in the Bronze Age, many motifs were used in common by the arts of the Aegean, Egypt, and the Near East, in order to come to a conclusion as to whether this common usage can be attributed to indigenous creation in each separate area or whether it is due to crossfertilisation of the artistic traditions.

The thesis is presented in two volumes, VOLUME I TEXT and VOLUME II PLATES. The text volume contains a list of abbreviations, the text arranged in four sections, *Introduction*, *Part I The Motifs*, *Part II The Artistic Issues*, and *Conclusion*, a bibliography and chronological table. The plate volume contains the plates and plate list, a concordance of sites and plates, a concordance of motifs in Aegean glyptic, and a set of maps. The plate volume is considered integral to the thesis as being the true record of the primary source material.

In VOLUME I TEXT the *Introduction* states the aim of the thesis, outlines the chronological stand taken, defines the principal artistic terms used, and defends the methodology of iconographical analysis.

*Part I The Motifs* discusses over fifty motifs covering a wide variety of subjects, heraldic and religious symbols, floral and linear designs, the human figure, and general themes like war and the hunt. With the help of a precise terminology these motifs are studied individually having regard to their early traditions, their subsequent modifications, and to the variations acceptable in different areas.

*Part II The Artistic Issues* opens with a discussion of the problems that arise from the above detailed survey of motifs, the most important one being the question of possible transference of motifs from one artistic tradition to another. On the basis of the correspondence of iconographical detail it is argued that twelve motifs transfer from the eastern traditions to Aegean art and that two motifs transfer from the Aegean to the East. The iconography also suggests the likelihood of the transference of smaller motifs and artistic details out of large scale compositions. The result of these transferences is the establishment in the Late Bronze Age of an International Repertoire of motifs drawn upon by the artists of many lands, Aegean and eastern. *Part II* goes on to assess the extent to which the foreign motif is assimilated into the indigenous tradition. Two levels of penetration are distinguished, an initial level, the Intrusive Element, and a deeper level, the Incorporated Element, where the exotic motif is assimilated into the local style. *Part II* further argues that some pieces fall into a special category for which the recently coined phrase International Style is accepted, and after classifying some special examples, it examines the means by which the motif transferences may have been effected. *Part II* concludes with a discussion on the acceptance or rejection of particular motifs by Minoan and Mycenaean art.

The *Conclusion* provides a summary of the results of this investigation of artistic motifs, and assesses the contribution of this thesis to scholarship in the fields of ancient art and art history.

## ABBREVIATIONS

- AKUR      AKURGAL, E. (1962) *The Art of the Hittites*.
- ALAL      WOOLLEY, C. L. (1955) *Alalakh*.
- ALDR      ALDRED, C. (1971) *Jewels of the Pharaohs*.
- AMIET      AMIET, P. (1961) *La Glyptique Mésopotamienne Archaïque*.
- BYB.D      DUNAND, M. (1954) *Fouilles de Byblos, Tome II*.
- BYB.M      MONTET, P. (1928) *Byblos et l'Égypte*.
- BOG V      BERAN, T. (1967) *Die Hethitische Glyptik von Bogazkoy I*.
- BUCH      BUCHANAN, B. (1966) *Catalogue of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum Vol. I Cylinder Seals*.
- CCA3      KENNA, V.E.G. (1971) *Corpus of Cypriote Antiquities Vol. 3 Catalogue of Cypriote Seals of the Bronze Age in the British Museum*.
- CMS      *Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel*.
- I      SAKELLARIOU, A. (1965) *Die Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel des Nationalmuseums in Athen*.
- II.1   PLATON, N. (1969) *Iraklion Archäologisches Museum, Die Siegel der Vorpalastzeit*.
- II.5   PINI, I. (1970) *Iraklion Archäologisches Museum, Die Siegelabdrucke von Phästos*.
- IV      SAKELLARAKIS, J. A. and KENNA, V.E.G. (1969) *Iraklion Sammlung Metaxas*.
- V      PINI, I. (1975) *Kleinere Griechische Sammlungen*.
- VII      KENNA, V.E.G. (1967a) *Die Englischen Museen II*.
- VIII   KENNA, V.E.G. (1966a) *Die Englischen Privatsammlungen*.
- IX      VAN EFFENTERRE, H. and M. (1972) *Cabinet des Médailles de la Bibliothèque Nationale Paris*.
- XII      KENNA, V.E.G. (1972) *Nordamerika I, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art*.
- XIII   KENNA, V.E.G. and THOMAS, E. (1974) *Nordamerika II, Kleinere Sammlungen*.
- FRANK AA   FRANKFORT, H. (1954) *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*.



- FRANK CS FRANKFORT, H. (1939) *Cylinder Seals*.
- FURU FURUMARK, A. (1941a) *The Mycenaean Pottery*.
- KARA KARAGEORGHIS, V. (1968) *Cyprus*.
- KARO KARO, G. (1930) *Die Schachtgräber von Mykenai*.
- LANGE LANGE, K. (1961) *Egypt, Architecture, Sculpture, Painting*.
- MARIN MARINATOS, S. (1960) *Crete and Mycenae*.
- MICH MICHALOWSKI, K. (1969) *The Art of Ancient Egypt*.
- PARR PARROT, A. (1960) *Sumer*.
- PN *The Palace of Nestor*
- I BLEGEN, C. W. and RAWSON, M. (1966) *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Vol. I The Buildings and their Contents*.
- II LANG, M. L. (1969) *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Vol. II The Frescoes*.
- III BLEGEN, C. W., RAWSON, M., TAYLOUR, W. LORD, DONOVAN, W. P. (1973b) *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Vol. III Acropolis and Lower Town, Tholoi, Grave Circle, and Chamber Tombs Discoveries outside the Citadel*.
- PM *The Palace of Minos*.
- I-IV EVANS, A. J. (1921-35) *The Palace of Minos at Knossos Vols. I-IV*.
- SMITH AA SMITH, W. S. (1958) *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*.
- SMITH IN SMITH, W. S. (1965) *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East*.
- SMITH OK SMITH, W. S. (1946) *Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom*.
- STROM STROMMINGER, E. (1964) *The Art of Mesopotamia*.
- THERA MARINATOS, S. (1968-76) *Excavations at Thera Vols. I-VII*.
- TIRYNS SCHLIEMANN, H. (1886) *Tiryns*.
- VERM VERMEULE, E. (1964) *Greece in the Bronze Age*.
- WEST WESTENDORF, W. (1968) *Ancient Egypt*.

## Introduction

### 1 INTRODUCTION AND CHRONOLOGY

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the artistic phenomenon that, in the Bronze Age, many motifs were used in common by the arts of the Aegean, Egypt, and the Near East, in order to attempt to determine whether this common usage can be attributed to indigenous creation in each separate area or whether it is due to exchange between the artistic traditions.

The chronological limits for the thesis are c3500,<sup>1</sup> the development of Sumerian picture writing and the first flowering of architecture and the figurative arts in Mesopotamia, and 1190, the defeat of the Peoples of the Sea by Ramesses III. These limits allow the full discussion of the development of the motifs in their artistic traditions from the time of their first appearance in the Bronze Age until the time when the world that shaped those traditions was profoundly changed. To continue the investigation of artistic traditions into the changed world postdating the destructions caused by the Sea Peoples' invasions and on into the transition into the Iron Age would bring up issues of artistic creativity and inter-relations that in many ways would be quite different from those pertaining before 1190.

The chronology in general accepted here is that of Hayes, Rowton, and Stubbings in the Third Edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*. For the Aegean area the dating sequences for the Late Bronze Age have been refined according to the recent proposals by

---

1. All dates in the text are B.C.

Hankey and Warren in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*.<sup>2</sup> A Chronological Note explaining the detail of the dating and a Chronological Table covering the period c3500 to c1190 follow this *Introduction*.<sup>3</sup>

Of the art terminology employed in this thesis two terms need definition: the first, "motif ", because it provides the organization of the basic material for the thesis; the second, "artistic tradition", because it implies such a blend of geographical, chronological, and cultural connotations that confusion can arise. The word, motif, is used for any distinctive artistic design which has clearly identifiable constituent elements. The design may be used in isolation or as part of a larger artistic composition in which case it displays certain precise relationships to the other constituent motifs. The design may have a very long life, being used by successive generations of artists. These three aspects, distinctive detail, precise usage, and the longevity of motif tradition, combine to give the motif an individuality which makes it readily recognizable. This individuality is exemplified in the Struggling Hero motif. Seen first in the sealings of the Early Dynastic Period and soon to reach its most precise iconographical statement in the Akkadian Period, it is used continuously in the art of Mesopotamia and that of some peripheral areas until Achaemenid times. A long list of important people from heroes of early Ur and old Babylon, through King Saustatar of Mitanni to the winged genius of Assyria and the Persian rulers, use this motif as their insignia. Its capacity for endurance is

---

2. HANKEY and WARREN (1974).

3. Below pp. 12-14.

paralleled by its ability to spread its influence far and wide. Not only is the art of the areas immediate to the Tigris-Euphrates plain affected but also those of Anatolia, Uratu, Syria and Palestine. Its peregrinations through time and space cause variations in the externals of the motif. The dress of the protagonist changes from a simple girdle to a great king's regalia but the motif itself remains unchanged in essential characteristics. These minor alterations in dress and background indicate an updating on the part of the artist to make the motif acceptable to his contemporaries. The very pervasiveness of the Struggling Hero and other distinctive designs which have similar histories, suggests that the motif has an entity of its own, a memorable quality, perhaps compounded out of meaning and representation, that helps account for its enduring character.

The identification of motifs with their distinctive details and the analysis of their regular and long usage can only proceed when there is an established artistic tradition like those created by conservative societies. Such artistic traditions are found with the Bronze Age civilizations of the eastern Mediterranean, Egypt, and the Mesopotamian areas. Study of these artistic traditions reveals that the aesthetic principle is not the governing one in ancient art. The demands of the religious beliefs on the people, and the requirements of the particular social structure evolved in accordance with those beliefs, are factors which dictate the subject matter and the form of the art far more imperiously than the aesthetic appeal.<sup>4</sup> One of the

---

4. Though the aesthetic sensibility of the ancient artist should always be allowed. William Stevenson Smith observes,

"I do not think that we can deny that the sculptor may have gained something of the same pleasure that we feel in the beautiful colouring of the stone in such statues as the diorite Cephren, however much he may have felt the necessity for covering it with paint to look like the living king...

We may perhaps assume that the sculptor himself had something of our own appreciation of his work ... even though a conscious formulation of the aesthetic qualities of a work of art had as yet to be evolved."

SMITH OK pp. 108-9.

effects of the demands of the religious society is the extreme conservatism of ancient art. The depiction of a god with particular dress and special attributes could hardly be changed by a later generation. That would be sacrilege. The role of the king must always be clearly stated in the time-honoured formulae. Any change may threaten his pre-eminent position or his relationship with the gods. Thus the pressure is always there for the ancient artist to stay within the traditional representation. Innovation is not prized for its own worth.

The Egyptian artistic tradition is the one most readily discernable as belonging to one area and one civilization. Here the development of motifs can be traced from Pre-Dynastic times down into the New Kingdom with relative ease. The Mesopotamian tradition is less easily defined, for while it is centred on the land of the two rivers, it nevertheless comprises many cultural strands. Sumerian, Akkadian, and Old Babylonian art will be considered separately when it is necessary for the understanding of the detail of a motif. At other times when points of contrast are being made with the Egyptian or Aegean traditions, it will be sufficient to use the generic term Mesopotamian art. In the Aegean area the two major traditions, Minoan and Mycenaean, are even more difficult to define since the relationship between the two is complex and is still imperfectly understood. The term Minoan art is here taken to mean that artistic tradition of distinctive style developed in Crete in the Bronze Age. Minoan art is basically indigenous but is subject to outside influences from time to time and it will be part of the task of this thesis to decide whether some of these outside influences result in the adoption by Minoan art of motifs which belong to other artistic traditions.

For the art of mainland Greece of the Early and Middle Bronze Ages, the term Helladic is used. Mycenaean art is created when this indigenous Helladic tradition comes under stimulating influence of Minoan art at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age and the Minoan content is transmuted into a new style, Mycenaean. There may also be other elements in Mycenaean art which, so far as motifs are concerned, it will be the task of this thesis to identify.

The corpus of Minoan art, and of Mycenaean art for the LHIIIA and IIIB periods, is relatively easily identified but there are many pieces from the Mainland of the 16th and 15th centuries and some examples from Crete of the late 15th and early 14th centuries where the attribution to a particular style, Minoan or Mycenaean, is extremely difficult. This is a much debated question and various criteria, including racial characteristics, the costliness of the piece, and the skill of the craftsman, have been adduced to help differentiate Minoan from Mycenaean. None have proved entirely satisfactory for, as John Boardman has remarked, "When the criteria are applied to individual pieces the possibilities of disagreement and error are total".<sup>5</sup> However an attempt is made here to assign to the Aegean pieces in *Part I* a Minoan or Mycenaean origin and to discuss in *Part II* aspects of Minoan and Mycenaean styles according to three criteria. When the subject matter comprises motifs drawn from the world of nature, neither style is naturalistic but the Minoan attempts to convey the sense of a living organism and of inherent

---

5. BOARDMAN (1970) p. 55. In the section on Mycenaean seals, pp. 54-9, he advises that most of the gems found in Greece are to be considered Mycenaean in style, however Minoan many may look, because the designs are more stylized, and stylized in a different way than the Minoan.

movement in the life forms while the Mycenaean tends to reduce them to controlled patterns or abstract designs.<sup>6</sup> When these motifs are to be organized into a larger composition, the Minoan tends to regard the whole surface as an entity to be covered, the "Unity decoration", while the Mycenaean tends to see the composition built up of small units regularly arranged to cover the surface, the "Tectonic decoration".<sup>7</sup> When there is an attempt at narrative, the Minoans reveal more appreciation of the narrative concept while the Mycenaeans dramatise the climactic point,<sup>8</sup> often with great violence and aggression.<sup>9</sup> However, these criteria can only be taken as a guide since there appear to be many exceptions. The torsional quality of unity designs is not restricted to Minoan works but is found in pieces that must be considered Mycenaean and this probably reflects a common Aegean tradition continuing from the Early Bronze Age. Not all stiff poses or heraldic compositions are Mycenaean; it is easy to underestimate the formalism of Minoan art. Some help is given in the problem of ascertaining the origin of individual pieces by non-stylistic criteria, the standard of cutting and drilling on stone gems<sup>10</sup> or the fusion and fixing techniques for metalwork.<sup>11</sup> For most pieces of the

---

6. HIGGINS (1967) pp. 32, 52, 78-80, 91.

FURUMARK (1950) pp. 157-9 discusses the octopus in Minoan and Mycenaean art as an example.

7. FURU pp. 112ff.

8. DAVIS (1977) pp. 13-8.

9. VERM Chapter VII Art in the Palaces has many observations on Mycenaean Style, especially pp. 187, 194-5, 203, 218-9, 223-4.

10. BOARDMAN (1970) pp. 57-8.

11. DAVIS (1977) Chapter III, pp. 328ff.

16th, 15th, and early 14th centuries the date given with their publication (stylistic or archaeological) does not contravene the criteria accepted here, and so the date has been taken as indicating origin; LMI, LMII, LMIIIA, as indicating Minoan art, LHI, LHIIA and LHIIB, LHIIIA, as indicating Mycenaean art. Where there is a discrepancy between the published date and the style of the piece as perceived here an explanation of the changed attribution will be made in the text.<sup>12</sup> A particular problem arises with the Pylos sealings. These are archaeologically dated to LHIIIB<sub>2</sub> but the seals that made them may have been manufactured much earlier. The examples cited here are listed as LHIIIB but where a design appears stylistically to belong to an earlier period, or even to Minoan workmanship, an explanation will be given.<sup>13</sup> The attributions made here may not all be accepted. However, even if particular attributions are contested the important issue is the establishment of the usage of the motif in the Aegean area as distinct from its usage in the East. In this context the term Aegean art will be seen as a compendious term useful for juxtaposing the artistic traditions of this western sphere (Cycladic, Helladic, Minoan and Mycenaean but particularly the latter two) against the eastern artistic traditions.

Lesser artistic traditions will be discussed when a motif's development dictates their inclusion. Thus Syrian, Hittite, Mitannian and Cypriot art will often provide examples of motifs while Old Assyrian and Palestinian examples will be mentioned less frequently. When a composite term is required to cover all these lesser traditions

---

12. The pieces are 49, 67A to 68B, 87, 139, 140, 317, 339, 356, 364, 366, 378.

With earlier or later pieces there are fewer problems in accepting that pieces given an EM or MM date are Minoan in style and pieces given an LHIIIA<sub>2</sub> or LHIIIB date are Mycenaean in style.

13. As with the sealings 317, 366.



and the major two the Egyptian and the Mesopotamian, the term eastern traditions will be employed. Correspondingly the term East covers all the lands which are the homes of these traditions.

The methodology followed in this artistic investigation is that of iconographical analysis.<sup>14</sup> The use of motifs in the artistic traditions of the Bronze Age is surveyed with most attention to the major traditions of each area; the Minoan and the Mycenaean traditions in the Aegean, the Egyptian and the Mesopotamian traditions in the East. A selection of representative examples of the motifs is assembled, illustrated, and closely examined with regard to their constituent elements and their behaviour in relation to other motifs in extended compositions. All types of art are included, sculpture, fresco, ivory, metalwork, terracotta, pottery; in fact anything that exhibits a design and has been published with an illustration. Depending on the chances of archaeological discovery and the accidents of preservation, the evidence comes from palaces, temples, private houses, graves and tombs. It should be mentioned at this stage that the Plate Volume is to be considered an integral part of the thesis. Far from being a mere adjunct to the text, it is the true record of the primary source material and it is envisaged that the reader, by

---

14. PANOFSKY (1962) pp. 14-15. In a most important essay on artistic interpretation Panofsky calls this level of artistic discussion Level I Pre Iconographical Description. Only in one chapter in this thesis is there any substantial move into the area of meaning, which I would term "iconographical interpretation", where Panofsky terms it Level II Iconographical Analysis and Level III Iconographical Interpretation. This is in Chapter 9 where an explanation of the reasons for the acceptance by the Minoans and Mycenaeans of some motifs but the rejection of others is attempted. However I have not used Panofsky's specific but unfamiliar terms but, for the sake of simplicity, have adopted the commonly accepted meaning of the terms, "iconographical analysis", for explaining precise observable detail and "iconographical interpretation" where the discussion proceeds into the areas of meaning and symbolism.

keeping the art pieces with their motifs constantly in view, will be enabled to gauge the extent of the coincidence in iconographical detail.

It is most important to stress the objectivity of the methodology of iconographical analysis. There is no recourse to religious beliefs or psychological explanations or the interpretation of artistic symbols.<sup>15</sup> This thesis works at the level of observable artistic detail and is careful to define each motif and proceed by means of illustration to show each detail of acceptable variation and each detail of regular usage. Doubtful, ambiguous, or indistinct renderings have not been adduced as evidence; nor have examples referred to in the texts of other authors been included unless they can, by careful inspection, be shown to belong to the motif as defined here.

The ordering of the motifs for discussion has been dictated by the aim of the thesis to investigate the common usage of motifs by the Aegean and eastern artistic traditions. Three groups of motifs have been distinguished. The first group, treated in Chapter 2, comprises those motifs where a regular usage in both the Aegean and eastern traditions can be observed. The second group, discussed in Chapter 3, comprises those motifs which show strong usage in their own tradition be it Aegean or eastern, but which are paralleled in the other tradition only by isolated examples if any. The third group, discussed in Chapter 4, is composed of artistic conventions

---

15. The dangers inherent in any iconographical study of ancient art are well known. Modern meanings are mistakenly applied to ancient symbols. Descriptions in texts are wrongly equated with iconographical details. The Aegean area has the problem of lacking literary and religious texts to gloss the artistic iconography.

and themes which are found in both Aegean and eastern art. Within the Chapters, the order of discussion has generally been from human, or at least animate, subject matter to inanimate. However in the important discussion, Chapter 2, the artistic demands have imposed the order. It was necessary to discuss the motifs which were concerned with the organization of material first since their terms were required for an understanding of the iconography of the following motifs.

Within each motif discussion, the ordering of the examples is chronological and by artistic tradition.

In coming to a conclusion as to whether the common usage in the Aegean and the East is the result of indigenous creation in each area or of the exchange between artistic traditions, the method of argument is two-fold. Firstly, the transference of motifs is decided on the artistic criteria of the precise observable detail of highly specialized iconography; secondly the cumulative argument is invoked.

Earlier works have treated artistic motifs or have mentioned connections between the Aegean, Egypt, and the Near East in the Bronze Age. Some have compared art pieces from each of the areas, and have suggested the exchange of some motifs.<sup>16</sup> However the iconographical

---

16. This thesis is particularly indebted to the following works on motif analysis and intercommunications in the ancient world,

- P. AMIET *La Glyptique Mésopotamienne Archaïque*
- H. FRANKFORT *Cylinder Seals*
- E. VAN BUREN *The Flowing Vase and the God with Streams*
- A. DESSENNE *Le Sphinx*
- A. FURUMARK *Analysis and Classification of Mycenaean Pottery*
- H. KANTOR *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium B.C.*
- W.S. SMITH *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East*

and to the general works on art which have provided among other things access to so many illustrations,

- H. FRANKFORT *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*
- E. STROMMINGER *The Art of Mesopotamia*
- W.S. SMITH *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*  
and *Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom*
- K. MICHALOWSKI *The Art of Ancient Egypt*
- E. VERMEULE *Greece in the Bronze Age.*

analysis of artistic motifs on such a broad scale as that envisaged here constitutes a fresh approach to the difficult topic of inter-communications and comes at a time when a reassessment of all Bronze Age problems is necessary in view of the astounding productivity of archaeological research in the past three decades.

## CHRONOLOGICAL NOTE

The general outline of the chronology is to be found in the Hayes, Rowton, and Stubbings sections of the *Cambridge Ancient History* (1970-75), the discussion in Vol. I.1 pp. 173-247, and the Chronological Tables in Vol. I.2 pp. 994-1003, Vol. II.1 pp. 813-23, and in Vol. II.2 pp. 1038-45. Additional information is provided for Early and Middle Bronze Age Greece by the Caskey articles Vol. I.2 pp. 771-807 and Vol. II.1 pp. 117-40. The chronology of Cyprus is discussed by Catling, Vol. I.2 pp. 808-23, Vol. II.1 pp. 165-75 and Vol. II.2 p. 188. The chronology of Palestine is treated in Vol. I.2 pp. 230-3, 567-94, Vol. II.1 pp. 77-116, 526-55 and Kenyon's EB-MB term for the destruction period at the close of Early Bronze period has been accepted, Vol. I.2 pp. 567-8. The following dates listed in Vol. I.2 pp. 996, 998, 1000, Vol. II.1 pp. 820, Vol. II.2 p. 1038 are repeated here for ease of reference.

Western Asia: Third Dynasty of Ur 2113-2006  
 Hammurabi of Babylon 1792-1750  
 Final sack of Mari in Hammurabi's 35th year, 1758  
 End of First Dynasty of Babylon (and sack of  
 Aleppo and Babylon by Murshilish I) 1595

Egypt: Old Kingdom  
 Dynasty IV c2613-2498  
 Dynasty VI c2345-2181  
 Middle Kingdom  
 Dynasty XI c2133-1991  
 Dynasty XII c1991-1786  
 Sesostriis III 1878-1843  
 Ammenemes III 1842-1797  
 New Kingdom  
 Dynasty XVIII 1570-1320  
 Amosis 1570-1546  
 Hatshepsut 1503-1482  
 Tuthmosis III 1504-1450  
 Amenophis III 1417-1379  
 Amenophis IV  
 (Akhenaten) 1379-1362  
 Tutankhamun 1361-1352  
 Dynasty XIX 1320-1200  
 Ramesses II 1304-1237  
 Merneptah 1236-1223  
 Dynasty XX 1200-1085  
 Ramesses III 1198-1166

The refinements for the Aegean area are set out in the Hankey and Warren article in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* (1974). The problems associated with the dating of the accession of Tuthmosis III to 1504 are discussed p. 144 and the dating evidence available is cited pp. 145-9. The preferred high chronology listed in Table 3, p. 152 is as follows:

MMIII	17th cent. -
LMIA/LHI	c1570 $\pm$ 10 - 1515/05
LMIB/LHIIA	c1515/05 - 1460
LMII/LHIIIB	c1460 - 1420 $\pm$ 10
LMIIIA <sub>1</sub> /LHIIIA <sub>1</sub>	c1420 $\pm$ 10 - 1385
LMIIIA <sub>2</sub> /LHIIIA <sub>2</sub>	c1385 - 1350/40
LMIIIB/LHIIIB	c1350/40 - 1190
LMIIIC/LHIIIC	c1190 -

This means that the dates of the eruption of Thera, the destruction of most of the palaces and villas, and the destruction of Knossos which are dated to the end of LMIA, the end of LMIB, and the end of LMIIIA<sub>1</sub> respectively, would now be a decade earlier than the previously suggested dates of c1500, c1450, and c1375, listed most recently in CADOGAN (1976) pp. 19, 46-7.

Apart from the problems associated with establishing an overall Chronology there are the dating problems associated with individual pieces to consider. Not all pieces cited in this investigation have an historical or archaeological date. Recourse is therefore made to stylistic dating, which is the only dating possible for the overwhelming number of Near Eastern cylinder seals. For Western Asia the stylistic periods followed<sup>1</sup> are those generally used in FRANK AA, FRANK CS, STROM, BUCH, AKUR with the exceptions that Buchanan's Protohistoric Period is covered by the Early Sumerian or Protoliterate Period and transition to EDI, Strommenger's Mesilim Period belongs in ED, Frankfort's First Syrian Style equates with Strommenger's Early Syrian and Buchanan's Old Syrian Style, Frankfort's Second and Third Syrian Style equates with Strommenger's Middle Syrian Style, and the Hittite Empire period begins with Akurgal's 1450 rather than Frankfort's 1400. In the Aegean the custom of using the same terminology to refer to both a period and a style brings its own problems and confusions.<sup>2</sup> Generally in this enquiry the archaeological period is referred to by initials and numbers, and when the style is meant a fuller explanation is spelt out in the text.

---

1. Entered on the Chronological Table pp. 14

2. CADOGAN (1976) p. 17.

DATE	EGYPT	CRETE	GREECE	CYPRUS	HITTITES	MITANNI	SYRIA and PALESTINE	MESOPOTAMIA	DATE
3500									3500
3400								Uruk 12-5	3400
3300									3300
3200									3200
3100	Dynasty I							Uruk 4	3100
3000									3000
2900		EM I						ED I	2900
2800	II								2800
2700								ED II	2700
2600	III		EH I					Meskalamdug of Ur	2600
2500	IV			EC I				Ur I Ur-Nanshe of Lagash	2500
2400	V	EM II	EH II					ED III	2400
2300	VI							Sargon of Akkad Naram-sin of Akkad	2300
2200				EC II				Gudea of Lagash	2200
2100	VII - X							Ur III Ur-Nammu Shulgi	2100
2000		EM III	EH III					Isin and Larsa	2000
1900		MM I Old		EC III					1900
1800		MM II Palaces	MH	MC I	Pitkhana Anitta			Hammurabi	1800
1700	XIII - XVII	MM III New		II III	Khattushilish I Murshilish I			Zimrilim of Mari	1700
1600		LM I A	LH I						1600
1500	XVIII	LM I B	LH I A	LC I					1500
1400		LM I C	LH I B						1400
1300	XIX	LM I D	LH I C	LC II					1300
1200	XX	LM I E	LH I D	LC III					1200

Chronological Table

c 3500 - 1190

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Heraldic Poses

The animal kingdom has always been one of the main sources for subject matter in Mesopotamian art and even by the Early Dynastic Period a large repertoire of animal poses had been developed. These include the quiet pastoral subjects like the Animal File as well as those subjects in a more stylized arrangement like Frankfort's "heraldic groups."<sup>1</sup> In both these types of designs the animals adopt certain set poses. These poses certainly reflect the normal standing, reclining and rearing postures of the animal but the postures have been stylised and standardised. There is no attempt to represent the multitudinous variations of pose that exist in a real life scene of sheep filing through a field or of lions attacking a herd of cattle. The iconographical analysis undertaken by this thesis makes imperative the finding of a precise vocabulary for the stylized poses. Edith Porada's Glossary<sup>2</sup> defines a set of standard terms for figures and symbols but suggests for animals and monsters only that they are "rampant ... and standing ... unless a specific indication of their posture is given".<sup>3</sup> "Reversed" is her word for the animal pose forefeet on the ground and hind legs in the air while elsewhere in the text she uses the descriptions "walking", "crouching", "sitting".

---

1. FRANK CS p. 24.

2. PORADA (1948a) pp. XXIV-XXV.

3. Ibid. p. XXV.



Briggs Buchanan agrees to use this list for the most part but prefers "upended" to "reversed" in some contexts.<sup>4</sup> He certainly consistently uses the heraldic term "rampant" though chooses "reclining" or "recumbent" for the resting pose. Pierre Amiet comments on the heraldic nature of many of the animal motifs and uses special terms like "éployé" for the eagle.<sup>5</sup>

The absence of an agreed terminology is not a great deterrent to the study of the seal designs when the description in the text is to be used only in conjunction with, and as an elucidation of, the design shown in a line drawing or photograph of the impression. However when the study wishes to proceed further, comparing poses of one period with those of an earlier or later one, contrasting designs from one area with those from another country far removed, then there is an acute need for a precise and unambiguous vocabulary. There seems no point in endeavouring to concoct a new vocabulary when there is already a comprehensive one to hand, albeit from another time and another place, the terms of European heraldry. Indeed this purely functional argument for using an already existing, quite precise list of terms is not the only one in favour of employing the heraldic vocabulary. Artistically this would seem quite an acceptable procedure since the main constraint on the ancient glyptic artist and the artist of medieval chivalry was exactly the same. The first had to produce an individual seal design for each customer to be his identification mark, the second had to create an individual arms for recognition of the nobleman in the field of war. Both artists there-

---

4. BUCH p. xxi.

5. AMIET p. 112 Le répertoire animalier,  
p. 114 L'aigle éployé.

fore have the same concern for precise detail in order that the final design will be unambiguously distinctive and individual.

Though European heraldry has several well developed terminologies, in particular the French, German, and English, this thesis will use the standard English heraldic terms but simplify them to the extent that the poses of the lion and eagle are used for all animals and birds.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly the following terms for pose will be employed.

#### Body

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| statant  | - the normal standing pose of all quadrupeds, four feet on the ground.          |
| passant  | - as above with one of the front paws/hooves raised.                            |
| couchant | - the normal resting position.  |
| sejant   | - usually of felines, sitting on back haunches, front limbs straight to ground. |

#### Two Bodies

- |            |                        |
|------------|------------------------|
| addorsed   | - placed back to back. |
| in saltire | - raised and crossed.  |

#### Head

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| gardant   | - head looking out, full-face   |
| regardant | - head looking back over shoulder, 180° turned from the direction the body is facing. |

#### Wings

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| close     | - wings folded along the body.                  |
| displayed | - wings raised and shown full spread frontally. |

These will cover all the regularly used heraldic animal poses of ancient art except for four. In these four cases the heraldic

6. In Heraldry certain animals have special terms for the usual poses. Thus a stag is "lodged" not "couchant" and "trippant" not "courant". The terms for birds of prey are changed when the bird is not predatory. Thus an eagle is "displayed" but a dove is "disclosed". Further "affronté" is not used, only "gardant".

FRANKLYN (1967) pp. 103, 112.

I have not made use of the directional terms like dexter and sinister, though in any full usage for seal description some conventions about direction would be needed.

terms rampant, inverted, elevated, and erect will be used but with slightly wider meanings than their use in heraldry allows. Thus,

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| rampant  | - In Heraldry, body erect, one hind paw/hoof on the ground, the front paws/hooves raised and parted; now to be used for animals body erect both hind paws/hooves on the ground, front paws/hooves may rest on object or person, e.g. altar or tree or Master, Mistress of Animals. |
| inverted | - In Heraldry, used of wing feathers pointing down; now to be used of whole animals where head and front paws/hooves are to the ground, hind legs raised.  |
| elevated | - In Heraldry used of wing feathers pointing up; now to be used of wing poses where the wings are raised and placed back to back but because of the profile view only one is depicted.   |
| erect    | - In Heraldry, upright, used of any symbol; now to be used of heads tipped so that beak or nose points directly up and crest or horns are thus thrown horizontal.  |

The usage of Heraldic Poses in the different artistic traditions can now be defined in these precise terms. Illustrations 1 to 12 show the standard iconography for Heraldic Poses for the Mesopotamian and Syrian areas.

1. Cylinder Seal - Uruk Period.  
Rams statant, Eagle displayed.
2. Cylinder Seal - Uruk Period.  
Lions couchant.
3. Cylinder Seal - Early-Mid Syrian.  
Lions sejant each one front paw raised, Antelope couchant regardant, Griffin couchant elevated.
4. Cylinder Seal - Imp. Akk. III.  
Bull Man gardant, two Bulls rampant about a Sacred Tree, Nude Hero gardant.
5. Cylinder Seal - Uruk Period.  
Two Lions sejant about a Bull gardant in Human Attitude, Two Bulls rampant addorsed about a Lion in Human Attitude.
6. Cylinder Seal from Tell Asmar - Akkadian.  
Nude Hero gardant, Bull inverted, Lion rampant, Bull Man gardant.
7. Cylinder Seal - Uruk Period.  
Two Lions rampant addorsed regardant tails in saltire.
8. Cylinder Seal from Fara - Mesilim Period.  
Naked Hero gardant, Two Lions rampant in saltire, Two Bulls rampant addorsed regardant about a Bull Man regardant.
9. Section of a Plaque from Lagash - E.D.  
Lion-headed Eagle gardant displayed.

10. Cylinder Seal from Ur-ED.III.  
Lion-headed Eagle gardant close, various Quadrupeds statant or couchant.  
The other wing position, elevated but parted with both wings fully shown, is sometimes seen in ancient glyptic (also 331A, 335) but does not continue in regular use.
11. Cylinder Seal from Lagash - Gutu Period.  
Two Lions rampant in saltire, Double-headed Eagle displayed.
12. Cylinder Seal from Lagash-Gutu Period.  
Dragon statant elevated.  
This is not the usual elevated pose since part of the back wing shows.

All the poses have their origin early in the art of the Mesopotamian area in either Sumerian or Akkadian art. The relative absence of the sejant pose from these early designs is complemented by its increasing usage in Old Babylonian and Old Syrian seals.<sup>7</sup> Once established, the Heraldic Poses continue to be used regularly except that some of the complicated in saltire designs of the early Contest Scenes are discontinued. Additional examples that trace the usage of Heraldic Poses from these early Mesopotamian and Syrian depictions down into Syrian, Mitannian, and Hittite art of the Late Bronze Age are,

statant	- 31, 33, 34, 37, 96, 101, 109, 153, 154A,B, 208, 209, 268, 277A, 335, 345, 402, 433, 441, 459.
couchant	- 10, 33, 35, 48A, 111, 112, 120, 152A,B, 156, 174B, 338.
sejant	- 35, 48A,B, 94A, 219, 267, 338.
rampant	- 32, 34, 61, 62, 99B, 120, 151.
inverted	- 64B, 65.
addorsed	- 33, 47, 61, 152A.
gardant	- 32, 61, 62, 63, 64B.
regardant	- 33, 35, 61, 120, 152B, 154A, B.
elevated	- 35, 48A, 65, 83, 94A,B, 96, 99B, 101, 109, 110, 111, 112, 119, 120, 152A, 153, 156, 338.
displayed	- 61, 64A, 65, 111, 338, 433.

In the Late Bronze Age Cyprus begins to use Heraldic Poses extensively as in

38, 39, 40, 54, 69A,B, 70A,B, 84, 85A,B, 86A,B, 102, 121B, 122A,B, 157, 158, 159, 160, 271, 279, 340.

---

7. FRANK CS Pl. XXVII j, Pl. XXIX f, Pl. XLI a, g, j, o.

The Egyptian tradition also has some stylized poses which can quite appropriately be designated by heraldic terms, namely, couchant, passant, close, displayed.

13. Pectoral from Dahshur - Dyn. XII.  
Griffins passant close, Royal Vulture displayed.  
The stance of the Griffin trampling prisoners is adopted also by the Sphinx. Both use the paw raised of the passant position to display most eloquently, Pharaoh's overwhelming might. The wings of this Griffin are folded close along the body line.
14. Armlet of Ah-hotpe from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Sphinx couchant.
15. Pectoral from Dahshur - Dyn. XII.  
Royal Vulture displayed.  
The Horus falcon is also regularly shown displayed.
16. Designs from Egypt and Syria - c. Dyn. XII.  
Winged Sun Disk - Egypt,  
Winged Sun Disk - Syria.  
Here the wings displayed pose is an integral part of another motif.<sup>8</sup>

Other Egyptian and derivative Syrian examples down to c1200 include,

- |           |                          |
|-----------|--------------------------|
| couchant  | - 93, 95, 99A, 100, 222. |
| close     | - 174A.                  |
| displayed | - 204, 234, 343, 391.    |

In the Aegean sphere the poses couchant and statant appear in EM and MM glyptic<sup>9</sup> but there is little attempt to exploit these and develop a true Heraldic Poses repertoire. Late Minoan art shows more interest as in 68B and 349 but it is in Mycenaean examples from the Mainland that a full development is seen.

17. Rectangular Seal from Rutsi - LHI.  
Griffin statant elevated.
18. Lentoid Seal from Rutsi - LHII.  
Two Griffins couchant elevated. The Griffin behind shows only head and breast and wing.
19. Lentoid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
Lion sejant regardant.
20. Lentoid Seal - LHIIB.  
Two bulls rampant addorsed regardant horns in saltire.

---

8. See Winged Sun Disk below Chapter 3.

9. CMS VII 1, 3, CMS VIII 4, 11, CMS XII 8, 65, 74.

21. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHI.  
Bull couchant erect.
22. Lentoid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
Griffin statant elevated regardant erect.  
This position of the head, erect, has not been a regular pose of animals elsewhere to date and it would therefore appear to be a pose of Aegean creation. Its frequent use in Late Helladic designs and relative absence from Minoan examples found in Crete suggest a Mycenaean creation.
23. Gold Jewellery from Mycenae - LHI.  
Sphinx sejant displayed.  
To allow the wings to be displayed while the beast is sejant or couchant, it requires a quarter turn of the upper body to the front. Shown here in an early Sphinx; this variation in iconography is regularly seen in later Aegean Sphinxes and Griffins (26, 27, 103, 105, 123). It has not been seen to this date in the East, where the standard pose for wings is elevated and one wing is shown in profile, combined with the profile couchant or sejant poses. Thus the sejant displayed and the couchant displayed poses may be claimed as an Aegean creation. It may be another Mycenaean creation as the same details of usage apply as with the erect pose.
24. Gold Jewellery from Mycenae - LHI.  
Griffin couchant regardant close.  
The wing position close never becomes popular in the Heraldic Poses of Mycenaean art. The regular wing positions are elevated and displayed.

Other examples of Aegean Heraldic Poses from LMI and II and LHI and

II are

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| statant   | - 115, 167.                                |
|           | Note also the early Cretan seals 266, 437. |
| couchant  | - 50C, 97, 98, 113, 440.                   |
| sejant    | - 50B.                                     |
| rampant   | - 36, 67A, 68B, 81, 169, 349, 350.         |
|           | See also the MMIII seal 449.               |
| inverted  | - 67B.                                     |
| regardant | - 49, 50C, 167, 440.                       |
| erect     | - 115.                                     |
| close     | - 50A.                                     |
| elevated  | - 68B, 98, 113, 115, 116.                  |

25. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - Undated.  
Two Griffins statant regardant elevated.
26. Bead Seal from Menidi - LHIII.  
Griffin couchant regardant displayed.
27. Amygdaloid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Griffin sejant regardant displayed.
28. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Two Sphinxes(?) rampant about an altar sharing one Ram's head gardant.  
The wings are not handled in the usual elevated pose; both are indicated as also in 60.

29. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Two Bulls rampant addorsed regardant, horns in saltire.  
This is a companion piece in design to the LHIIIB seal 20.
30. Relief Plaque from Mycenae - LHIIIA-B.  
Griffin couchant elevated.

Additional Mycenaean examples of Heraldic Poses for LHII-III include

inverted	- 71.
addorsed	- 55.
gardant	- 60.

and for LHII-III to the end of LHIIIB include

statant	- 55, 76, 106, 165, 170, 181.
couchant	- 103, 105, 108, 125.
sejant	- 104, 124, 127B, 172.
rampant	- 42, 46, 58, 60, 75, 90, 166.
regardant	- 41, 42, 55, 56, 75, 90, 125, 165, 181.
elevated	- 42, 55, 58, 104, 124, 127B, 170, 172.
displayed	- 103, 105.

There are also the undated Mycenaean examples 74 and 123 and the Minoan examples LMII 87 and LMIIIA 88.

The foregoing survey of Heraldic Poses shows for eastern art an extensive repertoire developed in the Mesopotamian and Syrian areas which, by the Late Bronze Age, is only a little curtailed to have the statant, couchant, sejant, rampant, regardant, elevated and displayed poses used regularly. Two of these, the couchant and the displayed poses, have also found their way into the Syro-Palestinian repertoire from the Egyptian tradition and thus are doubly popular motifs. The other two Heraldic Poses used in the Egyptian tradition, passant and close, are not adopted by other arts. Mitannian, Hittite, and Cypriot art of the Late Bronze Age also shows regular usage of the seven Heraldic Poses listed above as favoured in the Syrian area at that same time.

After only minimal interest in some poses by Minoan art of EM and MM, Aegean art of the Late Bronze Age, in particular Mycenaean art, gives examples of the full repertoire of Heraldic Poses. By LHIII times it too favours the seven poses most regularly used in the East. Two variations to the iconography of the Heraldic Poses which appear in Aegean art and are possibly Mycenaean creations are the erect and the couchant displayed or sejant displayed poses.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Antithetical Group

Heraldic Poses, though sometimes used as a feature in themselves, are more often incorporated in larger compositions, one of which is the Antithetical Group. This term does not refer to any antithetical arrangement which can occur in many arts and include animate, inanimate and abstract figures. It refers to that particular motif involving a grouping of human or animal figures as seen first in the Mesopotamian tradition. Frankfort places the source of this motif in Syria,<sup>1</sup> though he does allow earlier usage of a simple antithetical group showing animals flanking a tree or plant.<sup>2</sup> Both these types should be placed in the category of the Antithetical Group, which is to be regarded as an artistic designation, a term for a readily observable and quite distinctive way of organizing particular subject matter.

In its simplest form this motif consists of two figures, each being the mirror image of the other, posed about a central figure or symbol. Two features are worthy of comment; the importance of the central piece as a focus and the balance and antithesis this design exhibits in contrast to the other favourite Mesopotamian design principle, the procession. This focus and antithesis is clearly seen in examples from the Mesopotamian tradition.

31. Alabaster Trough - Early Sumerian.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Ewes statant about the Byre of the Goddess  
with Lambs emerging below.  
Two Rams statant about the First Group.  
Two Symbols of the Goddess, one at each end  
facing inwards to frame the group.  
This example shows the variation of doubling  
the flanking groups.

---

1. FRANK CS p. 185. Note also the comments on Kirkuk and Assur p. 181.

2. Ibid., p. 204-5.



33. Steatite Vase from Khafaje - ED.  
Two Antithetical Groups.  
Two Zebu Bulls statant addorsed about a Figure.  
Two Lions couchant addorsed regardant about a Figure  
with Two Snakes above held by the Figure.  
The Figure takes a position Imdugud usually assumes  
as seen in example 1.

As an organizing design the Antithetical Group is most  
often used for rendering two of the most favoured themes of  
Mesopotamian art, Contest Scenes<sup>3</sup> and Animals at the Tree of Life.<sup>4</sup>

32. Cylinder Seal - ED.II.  
Antithetical Group.  
Contest Scene: Two Lions rampant about a Nude  
Hero gardant.
34. Cylinder Seal - Early Sumerian.  
Antithetical Group.  
Animals at the Tree of Life: Two Rams rampant on  
rocks about the Man in the Net Skirt holding out  
branches with Rosettes for the sheep to nibble.  
Two symbols of the Goddess, one at each end facing  
inwards to frame the group.

Other examples of Antithetical Groups from the Mesopotamian,  
Syrian and Hittite areas down to the Late Bronze Age include,  
1, 4, 8, 61, 62, 64A,B, 77, 149, 151, 153, 212, and some  
Mistress of Animals examples.<sup>5</sup>

In the East in the Late Bronze Age the Antithetical Group  
continues to be widely used. The Animals at the Tree of Life is still  
a favourite subject, Contest Scenes less so.

35. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.  
Two Antithetical Groups.  
Animals about the Tree of Life.  
Group of three Figures.  
Both these groups show a characteristic Mitannian  
use of the Antithetical Group design, in layers.
37. Signet Ring - Hittite Empire.  
Two Lions statant about a Ritual Figure.
38. Signet Ring from Enkomi - LCIB-III A.  
Animals at the Tree of Life: Two Goats couchant  
about a Palm, Two Birds elevated above.
39. Cylinder Seal from Hala Sultan Tekke - LCIIB.  
Animals at the Tree of Life.  
Compare the Mitannian rendering in 35.
40. Gold Pectoral from Enkomi - LCIIA-III A.  
Two Sphinxes statant elevated about a Palmette Tree.

---

3. Below p. 30.

4. Below p. 66.

5. Below p. 35.

Other examples of the Antithetical Group from the Syro-Palestinian, Hittite, and Cyprus areas of the Late Bronze Age are seen in illustrations 83, 84, 120, 155.

In the Aegean area the Antithetical Group is not used till the New Palace Period and LHI and II<sup>6</sup> but continues in use into LHIIIB.

36. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHII.

Antithetical Group.

Mistress of Animals:<sup>7</sup> Two Lions rampant about a Female with Elaborate Headdress.

A Mycenaean gem with a companion piece in 81, both using Minoan details.

Other Aegean examples down to the end of LMII/LHIIIB include 68A,B, 82, 87, 162, 167, 168, 169, 349.

41. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.

Two Cows couchant(?) regardant about a Tree/Pillar.

42. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.

Two Griffins rampant about a Pillar mounted on an Altar, regardant elevated.

43. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.

Two Female Worshippers about a Shrine.

44. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.

Two Acrobats inverted addorsed about three Papyrus Plants.

45. Lentoid Seal - Mycenaean.

Two Swans close addorsed about a Woman.

Other LHII-III examples are 29, 71, 104 and other examples where the date is not specific are 72, 74.

46. Lion Gate at Mycenae - LHIII.

Two Lions rampant about a Pillar mounted on an Altar, regardant(?).<sup>8</sup>

This is the most famous example of the Antithetical Group in Mycenaean art.

It is a companion piece in design to 42 above.

Other Mycenaean examples for the LHIII period on a smaller scale include 89, 91, 92, 146, 147, 165, 166, 171, 172.

This brief outline of the Antithetical Group motif shows clearly the strength of its tradition. It has remained a basic design

6. The balance in design exhibited in some EMIII seals (CMS VII 7, CMS XII 3, 10) and some Lerna Sealings (HEATH (1958) S45, S49) are examples of antithetical arrangements which occur in many arts, not the Antithetical Group designated here.

7. Below p. 35. CMS II.1, 442 may be an early (Pre-Palatial) Antithetical Group but appears to be an isolated case.

8. HIGGINS (1967) p. 92 suggests the heads were "probably set facing outwards" and this would accord with the space available.

in eastern art from the Early Sumerian Period in Mesopotamia right down to the Late Bronze Age and it has spread from the flood plain of the Tigris-Euphrates through Syria, collecting a reinforcement from early designs there, to Anatolia and Cyprus. No doubt much of this strength is derived from the boldness of the design but some must be attributed to its use to state the other important motifs, Animals at the Tree of Life, Master of Animals, and Mistress of Animals which will be discussed shortly.

Minoan and Mycenaean art both know the Antithetical Group and use it regularly to depict the Animals at the Tree of Life, Master of Animals and Mistress of Animals.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Mirror Reverse

Another motif which makes use of the antithetic design principle is the Egyptian motif, here termed Mirror Reverse. Though there might appear to be a superficial resemblance between the Antithetical Group and the Mirror Reverse they are quite separate motifs. The one belonging to the Mesopotamian tradition has the figures symmetrically placed about a centrepiece which is the focus of the design; the other belonging to the Egyptian tradition uses a symmetrical placement of figures and objects about an invisible median line. The space in the centre is not a focus. It merely provides the pivotal vertical about which the two sides of the design are balanced. The two sides are not each the mirror image of the other for there may be subtle variations.

Egyptian art regularly uses the Mirror Reverse to organize compositions in all periods.<sup>1</sup> One of the finest statements of this design principle is seen in the sunken relief of Sesostriis III at the Heb Sed Festival, 391. It shows the "invisible median line" and the subtle variation on each side. It also indicates how useful this "double" design is to Egyptian art which has always the dual symbolism of the Two Lands to express.

- 
1. Stevenson Smith speaks of the establishment of symmetrical grouping for those figures engaged in a single task in early examples from the Old Kingdom,

"The tendency was to compose these Groups symmetrically, but it is remarkable how much variety is to be found in balancing figures which rarely imitate the action to which each corresponds. Balcz has pointed out that very rarely is the axis of the group occupied by a figure but that more often the axis falls upon an empty centre."

SMITH OK pp. 337-8.

The adoption of this Egyptian design can be observed in the lands to the north at the time of the Middle Kingdom, particularly in examples from Byblos and in the eclectic designs of Old Syrian seals.

- 47. Dagger Hilt from Byblos - 18th C.  
Mirror Reverse: Two Goats rampant addorsed regardant.
- 48A. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Two Mirror Reverse Groups.  
Two Griffins sejant elevated,  
Two Ibexes couchant.
- 48B. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Two Mirror Reverse Groups.  
Two seated Figures flanked by two Dancers,  
Two Lions sejant.  
Even the canopy over the heads of the  
Kneeling Figures echoes the Heb Sed Pavillion.  
In other examples of the Egyptian sphere down to  
c1400, the Mirror Reverse principle guides the  
design of the two Pectorals 13, 15.  
Their adaptation in a Byblos workshop, 204, moves  
the Horus Falcon down to form a focus which makes  
the design more of an Antithetical Group about an Imdugud.  
Another Syrian example is the seal 94A.

In New Kingdom Egypt the Mirror Reverse continues to be a well-used design principle while Syria and Cyprus provide some examples from the Late Bronze Age.

- 51. Wall Relief, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Mirror Reverse: Two Pairs of Kneeling Women.
- 52. Bracelet of Amenophis III from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Mirror Reverse: The Heb Sed Ritual.  
Note this 18th Dynasty jewel carries the same design  
as the massive carved lintel of the 12th Dynasty, 391,  
which was the first illustration discussed for this motif.
- 53. Cylinder Seal - Late Second Syrian.  
Mirror Reverse Group: Two Bulls statant, horns lowered,  
Two Eagles close on their backs.  
An echo of the Imdugud usage, 10?
- 54. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - LC.<sup>2</sup>  
Two Mirror Reverse Groups: Two Goats statant, Two Lions  
sejant.

---

2. CCA 3 p. 25, the seal is described as "probably of Cypriote work effected by the Mitannian tradition". The tomb in which it was found is possibly of LCIII date but the style of the seal would indicate an earlier date than this for its manufacture.

In Aegean art the Mirror Reverse is not regularly used till the Late Bronze Age<sup>3</sup> and then it appears usually on small, or at least portable items. Mycenaean art provides many examples.

49. Sword Hilt from Knossos - LMII.  
Mirror Reverse: A Goat and a Lion rampant addorsed regardant.  
Possibly Mycenaean in style.
  50. Gold Ornaments from Mycenae - LHI.  
Mirror Reverse.  
A. Two Eagles close regardant.  
B. Two Cats(?) sejant.  
C. Two Stags couchant regardant.
  55. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Two Griffins statant addorsed regardant elevated.  
A perfect statement of the Mirror Reverse motif.
  56. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Two Goats rampant regardant.
  57. Signet Ring from Midea - LHII-III.  
Two Mirror Reverse Groups.  
Two Rams' Bodies in Snake Frames,<sup>4</sup>  
Two Goats(?) couchant regardant.
  60. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Two Lions rampant on an altar, sharing one head gardant.  
The LHII-III seal 28 also shows the head treated in this way.
  58. Relief Plaque from Mycenae - LHIIIA-B.  
Two Sphinxes rampant on a mound, elevated.
  59. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHIII.  
Two cows suckling, their heads bent back over the calves.
- Two further examples are the LHIIIB fresco, 108  
and the Pylos sealing from the end of the period, 125.

For eastern art the Mirror Reverse has its origins in the principles of design worked out by Old Kingdom artists in Egypt. It finds its way into the Syro-Palestinian and Cyprus areas where it can be observed on small items like seals.

The Mirror Reverse is also known to Aegean artists. Mycenaean examples from the Shaft Graves to the end of LHIIIB show a precise usage of the motif which is close to that of Egyptian art. There is however no specifically Egyptian subject matter associated with the use of the Mirror Reverse in Aegean art.

3. Two MMI-MMII examples, Phaistos sealings (CMS II.5, 282, and 323), exist but the usage does not become regular till LH times on the mainland.
4. These items appear to be the same as the Headdresses in 36 and 81 which have been called "Snake-Frames" though the "Snakes" have no features and look more like buds at the end of branches.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Contest Scenes, Struggling Hero, and Master of Animals

The Contest Scenes of Mesopotamian art have received much attention, particularly in the publications on seals.<sup>1</sup> It suffices here to outline the most common variations of the motif, particularly those applying to the main figure, the Struggling Hero, who may be the Naked Hero or the Bull Man<sup>2</sup> or sometimes a kilted figure. The Naked Hero wears only a girdle about his waist and is usually shown profile with his head gardant, framed by curly locks and a beard. The Bull Man is a hybrid creature with the upper torso of a man and the ears, horns and hindquarters of a bull. The Struggling Hero's adversaries are most often the lion or the bull and he grapples with these barehanded or attacks them with a long dagger, though this latter depiction is usually reserved for the kilted figure. Sometimes the contest does seem a real struggle but on the whole the issue is never really in doubt - the Struggling Hero will win. This is most clearly seen in those compositions where the Hero manages the beast literally with a "flick of the wrist" turning the creature upside down, the "inverted" of our Heraldic Poses. Indeed to describe the control the Struggling Hero has over these animals the phrase "subduing" will be used. When the Antithetical Group design is used to render

- 
1. See especially FRANK CS Ch II The Stylistic Development of Early Dynastic Glyptic pp. 52-6, AMIET "Les Héros" pp. 146-52.
  2. PORADA (1948a) Glossary p. XXIV uses the terms "hero" and "bull man". The "Struggling" is here added to help the description. Pierre Amiet, AMIET p. 146, warns of the uncertainty in calling these two figures Gilgamesh and Enkidu. Henri Frankfort, FRANK CS pp. 62-7, entertains the possibility of the Bull man being Enkidu but not the Gilgamesh equation. There is no proof that either is true. See the notes on the general problems of iconographical interpretation pp. 8-10.

the Contest Scene the new combination is called the Master of Animals motif. In this the Struggling Hero assumes control of a pair of animals flanking him and he is the focus of the design.

The examples 61 to 64B show the standard usage in Early Dynastic times and the variations known in the Mesopotamian, Hittite and Syrian areas down to the Late Bronze Age.

61. Cylinder Seal - Mesilim Period.  
Contest Scene.  
Bull Man regardant subduing a Lion rampant.  
Master of Animals: Naked Hero gardant subduing at neck Two Bulls rampant addorsed regardant.  
Master of Animals: Bull Man gardant subduing at shoulder Two Lions rampant.
62. Inlaid Harp from Ur - ED.  
Contest Scene.  
Master of Animals: Naked Hero gardant subduing at shoulder Two Human-Headed Bulls rampant gardant.
63. Cylinder Seal - Imp. Akk. III.  
Contest Scene.  
The Naked Hero struggles with a magnificent lion.
- 64A. Stamp Seal from Hattusas - Early Old Hittite.  
Contest Scene.  
Master of Animals: A Griffin Demon subdues two eagles.
- 64B. Cylinder Seal - Early-Mid Syrian.  
Contest Scene: Naked Hero gardant subduing at hind hoof a Bull inverted regardant.  
Note this figure also places a foot on the bull's neck in a stylized version of the motif.

Other examples from the eastern areas before the Late Bronze Age include 4, 5, 6, 8, 32, 33, 94B.

In the 15th century Mitannian seals make considerable use of the Master of Animals motif. However as the Late Bronze Age progresses Contest Scenes are not so widely nor so grandly treated as they were in earlier times. The trend to stylization seen in 64B continues and the few examples that there are tend to be but pale shadows of the former lively depictions. Cyprus however uses the motif more extensively, which might mark the influence of Mitannian seal designs.

65. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.  
Contest Scene: Master of Animals.  
A Winged Genius subdues two Sphinxes inverted.



- 66. Sealing from Alalakh - Mitannian.  
Contest Scene: Struggling Hero attacks a Lion rampant with a dagger. Mitannian, but following an earlier type.
- 69A. Cylinder Seal - 14th-13th C.  
Master of Animals. A sketchy rendition.
- 69B. Cylinder Seal from Maroni - Undated.  
Master of Animals. A lion is the "hero".
- 70A. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - Undated.  
Contest Scenes. "Heroes" subduing animals inverted, at hind paws/hooves.
- 70B. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - LCIB-II.  
Contest Scene.

Other eastern examples include the Hittite Empire adaptation on the signet 37 and a cylinder seal from Cyprus 120 dated 1350-1200 which shows the Hero as a Bull Demon with a neat Minoan waist and short kilt.

In the Aegean, Contest Scenes are not known until Minoan and Mycenaean art render the Master of Animals<sup>3</sup> in the Late Bronze Age.<sup>4</sup> In Aegean art the Naked Hero sometimes has a slim Minoan waist, usually Mycenaean short hair, and no Minoan cod-piece but a girdle rather like the girdle of the original Naked Hero.

- 67A. Lentoid Seal from Hania - LM.  
Master of Animals: Naked Hero subduing at forehead  
Two Lions rampant.  
These lions have almost gone from rampant to a new pose, perhaps better described as suspended.
- 67B. Lentoid Seal - LMII.  
Master of Animals?  
This one seems to be a design which uses the externals of the motif but which does not understand its true character.
- 68A. Lentoid Seal - LM.  
Master of Animals.  
The flanking animals have become Minoan Genii.
- 68B. Lentoid Seal from Hania - LM.  
Antithetical Group.  
The Master of Animals motif has changed here to a Cretan ritual with the Hero as object of worship rather than controller of animals.<sup>5</sup>

- 
- 3. CHITTENDEN (1947) pp. 105-13 comments on the Master of Animals in Aegean Bronze Age art.  
TAMVAKI (1974) gives a detailed appraisal of the motif in Aegean seal designs.
  - 4. Two Pre-Palatial seals (CMS II.1 442 and 469) may carry the earliest Master of Animals in the Aegean area but the design is indistinct. The usage does not become regular till LM and LH times.
  - 5. The authenticity of this seal has been questioned. Note the cautionary comments, BETTS (1965) p. 206.

The designs on these four seals show more affinities with Mainland dress and Mycenaean artistic endeavour than with Minoan and thus should possibly be designated Mycenaean in style - as are examples 71, 72, 74 to 76.

73. Cylinder Seal from Iraklion - LMIIIA.  
 Hero with Griffin over shoulder.  
 Included because of its unusual subject.<sup>6</sup> Whether it is an echo of a Contest Scene motif or simply a hunter bringing home his catch is not clear. The design on seal 197 should be compared. This variation may be an Aegean.

In Mycenaean art the Master of Animals form can be traced through LHII-III seals to the end of LHIIIB with a sealing from Pylos. Isolated examples of the single Struggling Hero motif also occur.

71. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
 Master of Animals.  
 A magnificent statement of the motif in Mycenaean terms.
72. Lentoid Seal - Mycenaean.  
 Master of Animals.  
 A somewhat straitened treatment of the design of 71 with both lions suspended.
74. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - Undated.  
 Master of Animals: The Minoan Genius is now the Hero.
75. Rectangular Seal from Asine - LHII-III.  
 Struggling Hero: Naked Hero subduing at horn a Bull rampant regardant.  
 This is very close to the original motif. The girdle is still seen as in 72 and 74.
76. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Master of Animals.  
 A sketchy treatment of the motif.

The Contest Scene with its Struggling Hero and Master of Animals is one of the important motifs of Mesopotamian art. Its influence is long lasting and widely pervasive. Of particular interest for this enquiry is its adoption in the Syrian and Mitannian areas and then in Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age. In these areas the Bull Man as Struggling Hero does not find acceptance. The Naked Hero, Griffin Demon, or Winged Genius is the Master, still struggling with bulls or lions and then with goats as well.

---

6. This seal is also suspected of being a forgery, GILL (1961).

In the Aegean area the motif is used in Late Minoan and in Mycenaean art with the iconographical details of hero's dress and animal's pose closely paralleling eastern usages. The Mycenaean seal 71 deserves special mention. Here the Struggling Hero is a nearly Naked Hero with a long tasselled girdle and wrap (not Cretan codpiece) and leggings, and he is short-haired and bearded, a Mycenaean not a Minoan man. He subdues the lions effortlessly, the inverted one at hind paw, the upright one at neck. These latter details parallel Mesopotamian iconography and have the verve and spirit of the early pieces.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Mistress of Animals

This motif appears initially to be a variation of the Master of Animals motif with the central hero figure replaced by a female one. This is not the case for the Mistress of Animals<sup>1</sup> is a quite separate and distinct motif with origins going back at least as far as early Mesopotamian art. At that time three variations of a figure with attendant animals are known. Firstly there are the designs on stamp and amulet seals from early levels in Susa of which 77 is a good example.

77. Amulet Seal from Susa - 23rd C.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Lions suspended addorsed about a Figure who subdues them at neck.  
The Figure wears an embroidered skirt and headdress.  
In discussing these designs Amiet does not specify the sex of the figure but he does point out that lions and snakes are the attendant creatures and links the "personnage" here to his "dompteur de serpents".<sup>2</sup>

The second type found in seals of the Early Sumerian Period at Uruk has a man, bearded, with rounded hair style, and a skirt marked in diagonals. He is seen in 34 and 209 in his usual role of feeding the Sacred Flocks with flowering branches. Strommenger calls him "the man in the net-skirt".<sup>3</sup> The third type is the figure depicted twice on an Early Dynastic vase illustrated in 33. The figure is not bearded, the hairstyle is different and though the

---

1. This title is used in preference to Potnia Theron which has so many links with later Greek art.

2. AMIET pp. 21-2.

3. STROM p. 384.

skirt is marked in diagonals it is not the net-skirt with border of the Uruk seals. These features and the identifying Rosette<sup>4</sup> cause Frankfort<sup>5</sup> to see here the figure of the goddess Inanna herself in spite of it being Amiet's "Tamer of Serpents". There is no space here to continue the argument whether or not the first and third type already constitute a Mistress of Animals motif. What can be said is that the Mesopotamian tradition quite early contains designs, separate from the Contest Scenes, where a clothed figure is flanked by attendant animals, the whole import of the design being control over but not struggle with the animal kingdom. On the contrary the figure is just as often concerned with the nourishment of the creatures as with power over them.

To the iconography of these early Mistress prototypes Mesopotamian art adds the details developed in the Mari area for the warlike Ishtar, an antecedant of which is the central figure in 345. Inanna-Ishtar<sup>6</sup> wears the Horned Helmet, shows her wings displayed, is armed with mace, spear, and scimitars, may have shoulders sprouting maces and scimitars, and is clothed in a long robe pulled back to reveal one leg. Variations show her unarmed and disrobing or quite naked. A prototype of this is shown in 395, an old Syrian version in 94A. In both these variations she may have attendant animals, the lion being especially favoured.

---

4. Thought to be a symbol of the fertility goddess.

5. FRANK AA. p. 19.

6. BARRELET (1955-6) pp. 222-60 discusses the dress, accoutrements and familiars of Inanna-Ishtar. She also mentions the problems of finding the origins of the "Mistress of Animals". Further issues are discussed in the article on a Mari plaque showing a Nude Female, BARRELET (1952) pp. 285-93.

In the Late Bronze Age, in Mitannian and Syrian derivatives of this motif, the Goddess figure is attended by lions, goats, bulls, ibexes (?) and snakes.<sup>7</sup> The seal in 156 shows a late Mitannian version while much of the developed iconography can be seen in the treatment of the Mistress of Animals motif on the Cypriot seal 78.

78. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - 16th-14th C.  
Mistress of Animals.  
Female and Male Sphinx about a Winged Goddess.  
The Goddess is in the robes and wings of Ishtar and carries her spear. Only the horned helmet is missing.  
A second Antithetical Group on the seal is a Bull Demon taking the role of the Master of Animals with suspended gazelles (?).
83. Carved Tusk from Ugarit - 14th-13th C.  
Mistress of Animals.  
Two Sphinxes sejant elevated about a Nude Goddess.  
The Aegean wing and breast curls are used here.<sup>8</sup>
84. Lentoid Seal from Enkomi - Late Bronze Age.  
Mistress of Animals.  
Two Lions rampant addorsed about a seated Goddess with Rosettes.
- 85A. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - Late Bronze Age.  
Mistress with Animal in Series.
- 85B. Cylinder Seal from Maroni - Late Bronze Age.  
Mistress with Animals in Series.  
Rosettes appear in both A and B.
- 86A. Cylinder Seal from Klavdia - 14th-13th C.  
Mistress of Animals.  
An Ibex couchant regardant and a Griffin statant elevated about a Nude Goddess winged, displayed.
- 86B. Cylinder Seal from Hala Sultan Tekke - 13th C.  
Mistress (Or Master) of Animals in Linear Technique.  
There must be some doubt as to the subject matter here.  
The design is similar to 85A and B but the sex of the figure was not specified there either.

In the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age the Mistress of Animals is seen in Minoan and Mycenaean seals. The Minoan example, the Late Palatial sealing from Knossos illustrated in 349, may be

- 
7. Ibid. p. 248 Fig. 1b, p. 250 Fig. 17, p. 251 Fig. 18.  
See also the discussion PORADA (1948a) "The Nude Female Figure" pp. 124-5, and "The Winged Goddess" p. 128.
  8. Details such as these suggest Mycenaean influence working on eastern designs and this may be what causes Tamvaki to accept suggestions of an Aegean "prototype" for Syrian Mistress forms.  
TAMVAKI (1974) p. 287.

the earliest depiction. It shows the Goddess in Minoan costume standing on a Scale Mountain<sup>9</sup> and flanked by two lions rampant. The two designs, 79 and 80, should also be included in this motif though they do not conform to the strict Antithetical Group formation of the Mistress of Animals motif. A term such as "Mistress with Animal" would suitably define this variation.<sup>10</sup>

79. Lentoid Seal - LMII.  
Goddess bearing a wether over her shoulder.
80. Lentoid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
Goddess bearing a ram over her shoulder.  
The upright figure carrying an animal over one shoulder seems an Aegean composition as already noted for 73 and 137.
81. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHII.  
Mistress of Animals.  
Two Lions rampant about a Goddess with Elaborate Headdress.  
The design on seal 36 is almost identical.
82. Lentoid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
Mistress of Animals.  
Two Swans close addorsed suspended about a Goddess who subdues them at neck.  
Another example with swans as attendant animals is 45.
87. Lentoid Seal - LMII.<sup>11</sup>  
Mistress of Animals.  
Two Lions rampant regardant about a seated Goddess.
88. Lentoid Seal from Knossos - LMIIIA.  
Mistress of Animals.  
Two Lions suspended addorsed about a Goddess.  
The debased iconography is interesting; marks near the head for a headdress, and suspended is more like couchant sideways.
89. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Votaries about a Lion rampant.  
The inversion of the usual grouping.  
See the Master of Animals inversion in 139.
90. Lentoid Seal - LHIIIA.  
Mistress with Griffin.
91. Lentoid Seal - LMIIIA.  
Mistress of Animals.  
Two Swans volant addorsed about a Goddess.

---

9. Below p. 120.

10. TAMVAKI (1974) p. 287 also recognizes the problem.  
Compare the Struggling Hero in 75 who has only one animal but not over his shoulder.

11. 87 is listed as Minoan, LMII, in CMS VII 118. However it is thought to have come from Mycenae, PM IV p. 333, and the dress of the goddess would seem to make it late. Stylistically it would also seem appropriate to place 87 here with the Mycenaean examples.

## 92. Sealing from Pylos - LHIII B.

Mistress of Animals.

Two Dolphins inverted about a Goddess.

Another LHIII B example, 147, shows a Double Antithetical Group with Bulls and Minoan Genii about a Goddess with Elaborate Headdress.

The Mistress of Animals has prototypes in the Mesopotamian tradition in those motifs where the nourishing of and control over the animal kingdom is depicted. To these designs of clothed figures with attendant animals can be added details from the later iconography of Inanna-Ishtar of the Mari area; special clothes, wings, arms and the variation of the Nude Goddess. An indication that the Mistress of Animals could have moved west from these areas to Cyprus in the 16th-14th centuries is given by the elaborate Cypriot cylinder 78 where the Goddess takes Ishtar's form. The armed Goddess and the Nude Goddess do not however regularly venture further west than Cyprus.<sup>12</sup>

In the Aegean area the Mistress of Animals appears both in Late Minoan and in Mycenaean art.<sup>13</sup> The clothing is Aegean, flounced Minoan dress or straight Mainland garb, but many of the iconographical details parallel eastern usage except that the theme of militancy never appears nor indeed does the "nourishing" theme. The other eastern theme of control over the animal kingdom does appear and is handled in a similar way. The power of the Goddess is not contested by the animals which indeed often show a calm and adoring attitude. The attendant animals are the same as in the East; lions, bulls, sheep,

---

12. The small gold ornaments from Mycenae showing nude women clasping breasts, doves above, may be one example of the Nude Goddess. Illustrated MARIN 205.

13. It has been asserted that the Mistress figure is more favoured than the Master form in Aegean art but TAMVAKI (1974) p. 287 discounts this by noting that the number of representations known is about even.



Sphinxes, Griffins, with a predilection, as in the East, for lions. In addition Mycenaean art uses Minoan Genii, birds, swans, and dolphins. Another close correlation between Aegean and Mesopotamian iconography in this motif is the design on the Knossos sealing 349 where the Goddess now in Minoan costume stands on a Scale Mountain, the home of Mesopotamian Deities.<sup>14</sup>

---

14. Below p. 120.

### Sphinx

This hybrid creature has two essential features, the body of a lion and the head of a human. The discussion here follows Dessenne's extensive study closely but goes on to include new evidence not available to him.<sup>1</sup>

Illustrations 93 to 108 exemplify the points worthy of detailed discussion, 93 to 97 for the early traditions and 98 to 108 for the Late Bronze Age, with examples 105 to 108 being Mycenaean of the LHIII period.

93. Sphinx of Ammenemes III - Dyn. XII.

Sphinx couchant.

This shows the Middle Kingdom variation of keeping the lion's mane whereas the original iconography showed Pharaoh wearing the Nemes headdress as with the Giza Sphinx and seen in the later examples from the New Kingdom 14 and 435.

This male, wingless, couchant Sphinx with either the Nemes headdress or the lion mane, Dessenne Types I and II, is the standard representation of the Sphinx till the end of the Middle Kingdom.<sup>2</sup> For Dynasty XII which seems to have had a special relationship with the Sphinx, Dessenne also lists one female Sphinx with the name of Ammenemes III<sup>3</sup> and another female Sphinx of this period is now known that of Princess Ita, found at Qatna. It would seem that the privilege of representation as a Sphinx has been extended to the immediate Royal Family. The iconography is standard except that a woman's straight parted hairstyle replaces the Nemes headdress or lion mane.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. DESSENNE (1957a).

2. Ibid. pp. 14-16.

Of the other examples given for the Old Kingdom there is doubt about the date of No. 1, the Abu Roash statuette, SMITH OK p. 33, and the paintings of No. 3 do not clearly show a head. They may be Griffins. See below p. 50. The amulets of No. 4 are not to be given equal status with the Giza Sphinx and the female head of p. 21 FN5 may not be from a Sphinx statue.

3. Ibid. p. 21 and Pl. XXXIII c.

4. SMITH IN Fig. 25, and p. 15. Princess Ita is the daughter of Ammenemes II.

- 94A. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Mirror Reverse.  
Two Sphinxes sejant elevated.  
All Dessenne's "Syrian features" are illustrated. The sejant position and this particular rendering of the wings elevated is a standard Syrian type.
- 94B. Cylinder Seal - Late 17th C.  
In the 5th and 6th Squares, Sphinx couchant(?) elevated. The Sphinx is now crested.  
Syrian examples of this period comparable to 94A and B are 212, 267, 338.
95. Sphinx from Byblos - 18th C.  
Sphinx couchant.  
This piece is probably of Egyptian workmanship since the iconography is so accurate even to the Nemes headdress.
96. Sealing from Hattusas - Old-Mid Hittite.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Sphinxes statant elevated about a Sacred Tree.  
The statant pose is favoured for the Sphinx in Hittite art and the headdresses have been changed to ones appropriate to Hittite customs.<sup>5</sup>  
Mitannian usage can be contrasted; 35 sejant, following the static Syrian type, and 65 inverted, betraying the Mitannian interest in action poses. The seal of the Mitannian King, Saustatar, has a Sphinx as Master of Animals, 471.
97. Sphinx from Hagia Triada in a MMIII context, Hittite Import.  
Sphinx couchant.  
However it more reflects the Egyptian treatment of tail and head with locks(?) like the Nemes or the mane.  
Dessenne (No. 300) allows Cretan workmanship.
98. Fresco Fragment from Knossos - MMIII-LMI.  
Sphinx couchant elevated.  
Part of a garment pattern on a Miniature Fresco, this Minoan Sphinx shows the beginning of two of the Aegean characteristics, the breast curls and the Adder Mark, the latter being better seen in the accompanying Griffin, 113. The third characteristic, the Plumed Hat, is seen in the Priest King Fresco.<sup>6</sup>

- 
5. Illustrated CANBY (1975) Fig. 13. This competent study on the Sphinx in Anatolian art in the 2nd millennium suggests direct Egyptian influence on Hittite forms, p. 246, and Hittite influence on Syrian details, pp. 234, 247.
6. Of the three Aegean features, the Adder Mark gradually disappears but the curls and Plumed Hat remain to the end. For the "adder-mark", first called the "notched plume" see PMIV pp. 181-3. For the Plumed Hat see the Priest King Fresco, PMII Pl. XIV and the late examples on Mycenaean larnakes, VERMEULE (1965) Pl. 27, as well as the early article on plumes, HOLLAND (1929). It is possible that in the Priest King Fresco it is a Sphinx which wears the Plumed Hat, and that it is a woman leading the Sphinx.

Dessenne includes the Zakro sealings as earlier Minoan examples of the Sphinx than this one. They are exceptional creations which lie outside the traditional iconography and as such have not been included here as examples of the Sphinx motif.<sup>7</sup>

Other Aegean comparisons for this same period include the example from the Shaft Graves 23.

- 99A. Bracelet of Amenophis III - Dyn. XVIII.

Sphinx of Amenophis III.

The new features of the New Kingdom are arms, female headdress, bent wings, a combination of Dessenne Types III and IV. Types V and VI which show the Sphinx as Pharaoh trampling his enemies also become popular now. These show the Sphinx winged but with the wings folded neatly along the line of the body. They do not change the outline of the Egyptian Sphinx design.<sup>8</sup>

- 99B. Cylinder Seal - 14th-13th C.

Sphinx rampant elevated. Eclectic in style, perhaps Cypriot.

100. Relief of Seti I, Karnak - Dyn. XIX.

Sphinx Orientalising.<sup>9</sup>

Dessenne's Type VIII. How sinuous the body has become, how unmistakeably feminine the head and headdress!

Similar features are seen in example 99A above and in 222.

101. Sphinx Gate, Hattusas - Hittite Empire.

Sphinx statant elevated.<sup>10</sup>

The expected sturdy Hittite form has an unusually decorative curled and Rosette-studded crest.

Hittite variations seen on the plaque 219 include the Sphinx sejant gardant and the Sphinx with Extra Head sejant elevated.<sup>11</sup>

The Sphinx throne of the Byblos ruler 208 offers an interesting comparison to this Hittite example of 101.

102. Cylinder Seal from Kition - LCIIB.

Mirror Reverse(?)

Two Sphinxes sejant elevated.

These Cypriot Sphinxes have the flat Aegean hat minus the plume.<sup>12</sup> The other Cypriot example 40 has the plume.

7. This fresco example, 98, has been taken as the earliest true Sphinx in the Aegean notwithstanding some strange beasts on Pre-Palatial seals (CMS II.1 55) which may be reflections of the Egyptian Sphinx.

DESSENNE (1957a) No. 294 and pp. 130-1 discusses the fresco example 98.

8. See the discussion of the Griffin in this "trampling enemies" role p. 48. Also for a couchant Sphinx of this period showing wings see DESSENNE (1957a) 240.

9. DESSENNE (1957a) No. 278 and p. 104.

10. Ibid. No. 288 and pp. 119-20.

11. Ibid. Ch. XIII Un type aberrant: Le Sphinx - Chimère, pp. 94-7.

12. Another Cypriot example, HIGGINS (1967) p. 176, shows a Sphinx sejant elevated wearing the flat Aegean hat with plume.

103. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Sphinx couchant displayed.<sup>13</sup>  
The three Minoan characteristics are clear though the row of curls has been reduced to two on the breast. The Plumed Hat cannot be taken as an indicator of the sex of the creature since women are known to wear the Hat also. It may indicate only the religious nature of the symbol.  
The two "streamers" above each shoulder may be a reflection of the flowing strands of hair of the Minoan figures.  
Dessenne (pp. 129, 131) attributes this wing position to Minoan artists but it has been suggested above p. 21 that it is a Mycenaean creation. The Mycenaeans certainly favour the pose.
104. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Antithetical Group.<sup>14</sup> Two Sphinxes sejant elevated about a Sacred Tree. Again the Plumed Hat and two breast curls are depicted but no Adder Mark. This is one of the very few times a Sphinx is sejant in Mycenaean art.
105. Ivory Plaque from Spata - LHIII.  
Sphinx couchant displayed.<sup>15</sup>  
The Adder Mark and Hat remain but there is some confusion over wing and breast curls and locks of hair.
106. Pottery Design - LHIIIB.  
Sphinx statant.<sup>16</sup>  
It is unusual to find a statant Sphinx in Mycenaean art. The ivory, 58, a rare rampant example,<sup>17</sup> should be compared to this 106 and to 104 above.
107. Female Head from Mycenae - LHIIIB.  
Female Head of a Sphinx(?)  
Painted white, it is female, but the only internal clue to its being a Sphinx head is its flat hat.
108. Fresco Pieces from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Mirror Reverse.  
Two Sphinxes couchant elevated.  
Given white skin they are female.  
In this late example there is no Hat, no Adder Mark, and the reduced Sprial compares with the other late Mycenaean examples 103 to 106.<sup>18</sup>

- 
13. DESSENNE (1957a) No. 313 (not accurately drawn) and pp. 138-9.
14. Ibid. No. 314 and p. 139. He lists also 315, 316, 317 as examples of Sphinxes in this pose.
15. Ibid. No. 306 and p. 137. See also the three similar examples from Mycenae, WACE (1953) Pl. 9c, WACE (1954) Pl. 39c.  
Other couchant poses are Dessenne's Nos. 296 and 298.  
He suggests they are Flying Gallops but they seem more like badly drawn couchant poses.
16. Ibid. Nos. 318, 319. These examples have no head extant and so may just as well be Griffins, see p. 47.
17. Ibid. Another found in Athens No. 319 and p. 140.
18. The hat is seen in a Pylos example, the ivory plaque, PNIII, Pl. 170, 1a, b.

This survey of the use of the Sphinx motif reveals that it is known in eastern art in the third millennium in both Mesopotamia and Egypt. Egyptian art continues to use the Sphinx as a most important motif throughout all periods. Almost without exception the Egyptian Sphinx is male. He is a god-lion, a figure of great religious importance, a guardian of the western lands and the dead. By the end of the Middle Kingdom, Syrian art takes up the motif and makes at least three radical changes. It relegates the Sphinx to a subsidiary position in design, poses it in new attitudes, and gives it new features of wings, headdress and tail. At Mari the Sphinx is a guardian figure with a feathered headdress. In Egypt under the Hyksos the Sphinx becomes even more favoured as a representation of the power and authority of Pharaoh. In the Late Bronze Age Syria increases the usage of the Sphinx, most often depicting it in the sejant pose. The Mitannians add new and more active poses to the Sphinx's repertoire while the Hittites also make use of it, particularly as the guardian figure. Cypriot art shows Sphinxes combining eastern and Aegean iconographical details.

In the Aegean area the true Sphinx is used in Minoan art from MMIII-LMI though it may have been known earlier. Here there are three new features. Spirals curl along the breast and wing bone, the "adder-mark" decorates the wing feathers, and the headdress copies the hat of the Knossos "Priest-King". Mainland artists take over the motif and work it in ivory or on seals. They use it more extensively than Minoan artists and add their own wings displayed pose. Towards the end of the period the Adder Mark and Plumed Hat are not considered essential parts of the Mycenaean iconography. It is not clear whether the Mycenaean Sphinx is male or female; the strength indicated by the

Mycenaean modelling of the leonine limbs suggests masculinity but at least one late example shows a different handling and is definitely female. Reflection of Mycenaean treatment is found in some late Minoan examples<sup>19</sup> and in Cypriot designs. Finally the Mycenaean Sphinx is always a stationary beast. Posed couchant with wings carefully elevated or displayed it recalls the impassive strength of the Egyptian Sphinx and provides a sharp contrast to the active poses of the next motif, its brother hybrid, the Griffin.

---

19. e.g. The Zafer Papoura relief plaque, PMII Fig. 506a.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Griffin

This motif is, like the Sphinx, a hybrid creature, and, also like the Sphinx, has the lion's body but instead of a human head the Griffin adds the heads and wings of a bird of prey. An extended study of the Griffin motif has been undertaken by Maria Bisi<sup>1</sup> but, although it provides more detail it does not supersede the findings of Henri Frankfort in his short but important article on the Cretan Griffin and his later comments on the Griffin motif in his subsequent publications.<sup>2</sup> Recently Angela Tamvaki has given an excellent summary of the iconography of the Minoan and Mycenaean Griffins.<sup>3</sup> This treatment of the motif will largely follow Frankfort and Tamvaki but points of difference and additional points and new evidence will also be discussed through the examples 109 to 132.

Winged hybrid creatures appear very early in both the Mesopotamian and Egyptian traditions.

109. Seal Impression from Susa - Uruk Period.  
Winged Creature statant elevated.<sup>4</sup>

This 4th millennium seal from Susa shows one of the groups of Mesopotamian hybrids with wings which includes the Lion-headed Eagle, the Lion Dragon, and the Snake Dragon<sup>5</sup> seen in examples 9, 10, 11, 12, 268, 331A, 335. Other early Griffin types are known from

- 
1. BISI (1965).
  2. FRANKFORT (1936-7); FRANK CS p. 186, FRANK AA pp. 67-8.
  3. TAMVAKI (1974) pp. 288-92.
  4. BISI (1965) 28.
  5. Below p. 55.



Egypt, 13, but their specialized usage<sup>6</sup> has led Aldred to class them as a variant of the Sphinx with the name "hierocosphinx".<sup>7</sup>

The crested Griffin proper appears in the North Syrian area about the second quarter of the second millennium B.C. Its progenitors are not the winged hybrid monsters of Mesopotamian art nor the specialized Egyptian Griffins. The Mitannians bring the Griffin to the Near East where it soon becomes an established motif in Syrian and Hittite as well as Mitannian art.<sup>8</sup>

- 
6. "Egyptian iconography knows the griffin exclusively as a destroyer of the king's enemies." FRANKFORT (1936-7), p. 110. Apart from early examples on palettes the Griffin tradition starts with Old Kingdom reliefs which show Cephren (?), Sahura, Ne-User-ra, and Pepy II, SMITH OK pp. 182, 148, 184, 203 and Figs. 104, 105, as Griffins trampling prisoners. As the heads of these creatures are missing they could be Sphinxes or Griffins. However it seems safer to assume with Smith that, in this role, showing wings, they are Griffins. This iconography is then scrupulously followed in the Middle Kingdom as in the Dahshur pectoral 13, where the distinctive cheek markings are seen on the peregrine falcon's head. It is changed only in the New Kingdom when the Sphinx too becomes the "Trampler" as on the war chariot of Tuthmosis IV, FRANKFORT (1936-37), Fig. 12. Bisi would wish to remove the "exclusively" from Frankfort's original statement, pointing to a humbler level of interest in Magic Sticks, apotropaic usages and the Beni Hasan Griffin BISI (1965) pp. 23-6, 36. However, here the royal iconography has been taken as the standard for the Egyptian tradition and the type to be considered when one is trying to allocate the indebtedness of other traditions. The Griffin on the axe-head of Queen Ah-hotpe, SMITH AA 86, stands for Mont, the god of war, and the symbol of Armant. The griffin in a painting of wild country represents the desert.
  7. ALDR. Discussion of the Dahshur pectoral p. 194 together with another he illustrates 25, 26 showing a wingless hierocosphinx most unusually posed sejant.
  8. FRANK CS pp. 186, 317; FRANK AA pp. 140-5. Whether the early Susa and Elamite hybrids (AMIET 236, Pl. 14 bis., K, M, N, 274, 417, 544-546) and the Mitannian Griffins are linked by virtue of their both being southern intrusions of a far northern tradition is an interesting speculation. It seems that Frankfort is allowing some of the Syrian designs with Mitannian motifs to ante-date the actual establishment of the Mitannian state.

110. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Crested Griffin rampant elevated.  
In this Old Syrian example the standard Griffin iconography is clear. Note particularly the elevated wings and the crest, this time of a single long curl. For other Old Syrian examples in usual poses see 3 couchant with paw on antelope, 48A sejant, 94B and 152A showing the active poses where Griffins leap to attack an ibex or goat. The pose in 3 may represent a codified rendering of the activity in 94B and 152A.
111. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.  
Crested Griffin couchant elevated.  
In this Mitannian example of 15th to 14th centuries the crest has three elements. Compare the other Mitannian example 156. In Mitannian glyptic and in Assyrian which followed it the Griffin and the Griffin Demon<sup>9</sup> enact similar roles. In addition the Griffin Demon is seen in Syria 212 kneeling and not winged, in Hittite art 64A, and in Cyprus 280 wings folded.
112. Seal Impression from Hattusas - Early Old Hittite.  
Crested Griffin couchant elevated.  
This Hittite example of c1700 has the crest of the single long curl. Compare the Hittite Griffins statant in 153.

The artistic traditions of the East continue to use the Griffin motif throughout the Late Bronze Age. Cyprus too shares in this common usage.

117. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XX.  
Crested Griffin statant elevated.
118. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XX.  
Crested Griffin statant(?) elevated.  
These two wall paintings showing booty of Ramesses III are later than most examples given but they reveal clearly the change in the eastern Griffin by the end of the period. Note the three elements in the crest remain but the body is attenuated, looking in 117 more like a horse than a lion.
119. Relief Plaque from Alalakh - 1350-1194.  
Two Griffins attacking animals.  
This badly damaged plaque shows more robust Griffins in the attacking role seen before in 152A.
120. Cylinder Seal - 1350-1200.  
Griffin rampant elevated.  
The pairing of Griffin and Sphinx continues the earlier regular usage in Syrian and Mitannian art as does the use of the Griffin as an attendant animal in the Antithetical Group.

---

9. See PORADA (1948a) pp. 139, 68. For other examples of the Griffin in Mitannian glyptic see the Nuzi sealings, PORADA (1947), where nearly 10% of the 1000 seals carry the Griffin motif. The best examples are 580, 598, 640, 649, 661, 662, 676, 734, 777, 857.

- 121A. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.  
Mirror Reverse: Two Griffins couchant elevated.  
This late 15th-14th century Mitannian seal should be compared to 111.
- 121B. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - 16th-14th C.  
Two Duels:<sup>10</sup> In each a Winged Hero with a dagger fights a Griffin elevated.  
Subsidiary: Mirror Reverse.  
Two Griffins sejant elevated erect.  
This design illustrates the new role of the Griffin fighting man.  
The smaller Griffins, while very much in the same style as the Mitannian seal above, seem to have the erect head of Mycenaean examples.
- 122A. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - 14th C.  
Crested(?) Griffin sejant elevated.
- 122B. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - 14th C.  
Griffin sejant elevated.  
Two examples where the design has been debased.

The true Griffin motif is also found in Aegean art from the beginning of the Late Bronze Age in both Minoan and Mycenaean examples.

113. Fresco Fragment from Knossos - MMIII-LMI.  
Crested Griffin couchant elevated.<sup>11</sup>  
This early Minoan Griffin<sup>12</sup> comes from the same MMIII fresco as the Sphinx 98 and corresponds to Syrian-Mitannian iconography closely, except that the crest has become a curvilinear plume and the Adder Mark now decorates the wings.
114. Miniature Fresco from Thera - LMIA.  
Griffin in the Flying Gallop, elevated.  
This fresco in Minoan style shows a hybrid with the head missing but it is taken to be a Griffin not a Sphinx because of its active pose. Its body is whitish and the wings coloured brown, elevated, with the Adder Mark clear, and some curls.

10. Below p. 121.

11. BISI (1965) 131. Compare the statant Griffins which are Attendants to a Mistress figure on a Cretan seal, HOOD (1952) Fig. 16.

12. The other early example from the Aegean area, the oft-quoted Melian bird-griffin (PMI pp. 558-9, 710-11 and FURU p. 232), MCIII, is not a true Griffin and far from being formative of the Aegean tradition is better regarded as a misunderstood Minoan or Mainland Griffin, if not simply a crested bird like the plover or lapwing. In Egypt this bird represented the people in the temple from E.D. times.  
The Old Palace sealings from Phaistos (CMS II.5 317, 318 and perhaps 319) also show winged hybrid creatures but they have none of the well-developed characteristic features of the Griffins 114 to 116 and later. This is noted by TAMVAKI (1974) p. 290.

115. Rectangular Seal from Rutsi - LHI.  
Crested Female Griffin statant elevated regardant erect.  
This carefully worked example has breast curls but no Adder Marks and is grossly female. There is also a rather worn example from the same site 17 which has no crest.
116. Gold Ornament from Mycenae - LHI.  
Griffin in the Flying Gallop elevated.<sup>13</sup>  
This appears to be a parallel representation to the Theran Griffin but the head is clear here and there is no crest.  
Other Shaft Graves examples are 24 couchant, with wings bent in an unusual folded position and no crest, and the dagger blade with a row of crestless Griffins in the Flying Gallop.<sup>14</sup> Other LHII examples are 18 crested Griffins couchant elevated, 22 crested Griffin statant elevated regardant erect. The Griffin in 22 shows the Adder Marks and is on a leash held by a long-robed man. The strength of the lion limbs in all these early Mycenaean examples is one of the most noticeable features.<sup>15</sup>
123. Rectangular Seal from Pylos - Undated.  
Crested Griffin couchant displayed regardant.  
This magnificent beast shows the strong limbs and displayed pose characteristic of the Mainland tradition. However, curls, plumed crest, and vestiges of the Adder Mark link this example back to the Minoan tradition. Other examples of this same period include 26, similar pose but wings fitted to the elongated shape of the seal, no Adder Marks; 27, sketchy design, sejant, no Adder Mark, curls reduced to drilled circles; 30, wings elevated, similar plumed crest, markings clear; 55, statant, curls but reduced Adder Marks.  
In all these the latent strength of the powerfully muscled limbs is an important iconographical detail. The strength is fully revealed when the Griffin is predator as in the fine ivories 482 to 484.<sup>16</sup>
124. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Crested Female Griffin sejant elevated.<sup>17</sup>  
Here the Adder Marks are reduced to lines and the curls to a pair on the breast of which only one is seen as in the late Sphinx example 108. Clearly female as were 17

---

13. BISI (1965) 132.

14. KARO XCII. There are also Griffins in a circular design KARO XXXII. The creatures on the Shaft Graves vessels, PMI Fig. 406a, b, may be local attempts at a Griffin type.

15. TAMVAKI (1974) pp. 289-91. All features have been illustrated here by 113 to 116, 123 to 128, and referred plates.

16. Also in the Pylos seal, CMS V 2, 642. Of LHI-III date the seal shows a Griffin carrying in its beak the body of a stag.

17. BISI (1965) Pl. XIV. The information on dating is not sufficient for the Cretan and Mycenaean examples.

and 115, this Griffin is held on a leash by a long-robed male figure as was 22. Other examples show Aegean Griffins associated with Hero figures 73 or a Mistress figure 90, or tethered to a Sacred Pillar 25, 42, 167 a LMII painted wall relief, 170, or 172 where a pair sejant elevated, simply flank the Pillar in the Antithetical Group.

125. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.

Mirror Reverse: Two Registers.

Below: Two Crested Griffins couchant elevated regardant.

Above: Two Griffins the same (in miniature).

On this late sealing the crest on the large Griffins is a double one of three and then four elements. Three or four feathers or curls are quite usual in Mycenaean Griffin crests whether of the angular variety as in 22, 25, 26 or the curvilinear type 18, 128. There are no Adder Marks and the curls are reduced. The small Griffins have no crest. This may be because their miniaturisation prohibits detail but another clear example of crestless Griffins in LHII-III is 42. There is also the couchant winged creature whose head is lost in 274A.

126. Vase Fragment from Mycenae - LHIII.

Crested Griffin and Lion.

They may be crossed as in the Pylos frescoes but combat is a possibility.

127A. Pottery Design - LHIIIB.

Griffin statant elevated.

This, the only pottery example LHIIIB shows a degenerate type with no crest.<sup>18</sup> A good comparison is the Griffin on the LMIII sarcophagus 243.

127B. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.

Griffin sejant elevated.

This late sealing shows a Griffin, no crest and no markings at all, in the company of men, almost like a pet dog sitting at their feet.

128. Fresco from the Throne Room, Pylos - LHIIIB.

Head of a Crested Griffin.

This example forms part of an extensive fresco showing Griffins and lions which flanked the throne in the Pylos palace. A similar fresco comes from Hall 46, the only other room with a hearth<sup>19</sup> though it is not so well painted as the Throne Room fresco. These Pylos Griffins are crested, with eyes drawn differently from real animals.<sup>20</sup>

---

18. The fact that this Griffin pulls a chariot (FURU p. 433) should be noted in conjunction with the Griffin on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus. Note also the splendid statant ivory Griffin, WACE (1953) Pl. 5.

19. PNII p. 99. "Chief of the heraldic animals at Pylos are the lion and the griffin. It is interesting to note that both appear obviously posed in much the same fashion in the two rooms with central hearths, as if reinforcing whatever significance the hearths may have had."

20. Ibid., p. 102.

They have reduced neck curls and are white or purple with all-over "leaf-markings". They are posed heraldically, couchant and in Antithetical Groups. At least one has head erect and there is the possibility of a Pillar or Tree of Life as a focus.<sup>21</sup> All the above points correspond to details seen in other examples<sup>22</sup> but there is one most significant change. In Hall 46 the Griffins are not winged.<sup>23</sup> At a time when the Griffin's iconography is so firmly established, so regularly used, the wings such a vital functioning part of the whole motif design, it is profoundly significant that such an important example is wingless. It must immediately be compared to that other grand wingless Griffin in the Knossos throne room, but discussion of the significance of this Griffin Apteros must wait.<sup>24</sup>

For eastern traditions it is Mitannian art that creates the true Griffin motif. Its iconographical features are crest with curl and three elements, violent action poses, and selected details from the Heraldic Poses repertoire. Syrian art possibly contributes the latter, particularly the wings elevated and sejant poses. The Mitannian Griffin is known in Cypriot art in the Late Bronze Age where it shows both Syrian and later Aegean features.

In the Aegean area the Griffin is used in Crete, on Thera, and on the Mainland from the beginning of the Late Bronze Age. All the iconographical details of the Mitannian Griffin can be found as well as some specific Aegean details shared by the Sphinx motif. Aegean iconography is well developed in the early examples with some of the best depictions coming from the Shaft Graves at Mycenae. There are several early examples of crestless Griffins as well as the

---

21. For a full description see PNII pp. 110-4, 194-6, 208-11.

22. Excepting only the purple leaf-marked skin. There are also fresco fragments from the Tiryns palace showing an Adder-Marked wing. Schliemann describes "a large winged creature" TIRYNS pp. 229-230. It may be a Sphinx or a Griffin.

23. PNII p. 99. The preserved fragments make this quite clear.

24. See below Chapter 9.  
On the Knossos Griffin restorations see the note, CAMERON (1970) pp. 163-4.

crested ones but the crest soon becomes obligatory. Minoan art does not seem to use the Griffin motif as much as Mycenaean art which makes of it a major motif. The standard iconography for the Mycenaean Griffin is clearly established in the seal designs and frescoes. He, occasionally she, has massive lion limbs, a fine crest, elevated or displayed wings which may or may not be Adder Marked, and curls along breast and wing bone. All these features are to be seen again in the Mycenaean ivories but whereas the seals and frescoes favour static heraldic poses, the ivories show violent action where the power of those leonine limbs are at last unleashed.<sup>25</sup>

---

25. See below Chapter 6, The Mycenaean Ivory Style, pp. 192-5.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Dragons and Crocodiles

In the Mesopotamian artistic tradition from Akkadian times there are two hybrid creatures that are designated dragons. One has the body and head of a snake, the fore limbs of a lion, the hind limbs of an eagle, and a lion's tail with scorpion sting at the end. The creature may have wings which can be shown elevated or close and it usually wears a distinctive crown with two upcurving horns. One of the finest depictions as seen on the Libation vase of Gudea where the creature stands rampant;<sup>1</sup> another is seen on Gudea's seal 12 where the creature is statant. This creature is here termed the Snake Dragon in recognition of its serpentine nature to differentiate it from the other dragon, which, having a more leonine cast, is here termed the Lion Dragon. This second hybrid has a lion's body, fore-limbs and head, the hind limbs, wings and tail of an eagle. These features are seen in the seals 331A and 335. The Lion Dragon may also be seen spitting fire.<sup>2</sup>

In Akkadian iconography the Snake Dragon is known as a familiar of the god Ningizzida, and is also regularly shown carrying deities on its back.<sup>3</sup> The Lion Dragon is the familiar of the weather gods and is regularly seen pulling their chariot or carrying them on its back. These iconographical associations continue into the Ur III period though at this time the Lion Dragon is seen in new role as the antagonist of the Bull Man.<sup>4</sup> In Old Babylonian glyptic, the

---

1. STROM 144, FRANK CS Fig. 33.

2. FRANK CS Pl. XXII a, d, f.

3. FRANK CS pp. 119-22 and Pl. XXI g, i.  
Frankfort identifies this Dragon with the "Lion Bird" of the texts and links it to Tishpak a northern Hurrian weather god.

4. FRANK CS p. 144 and Fig. 39.



Snake Dragon continues as a supporter of the Gods and the Lion Dragon continues in its attacking role. The Snake Dragon is now the familiar of Marduk<sup>5</sup> while the Lion Dragon is seen as a destructive force associated with Nergal the god of pestilence.<sup>6</sup> Early to Middle Syrian glyptic and Mitannian glyptic seem to favour the Lion Dragon.<sup>7</sup>

In the Aegean area the creature termed a Dragon by Doro Levi<sup>8</sup> first appears in the Late Minoan Crete.

- 129A. Seal Impression from Hagia Triada - LM.  
Goddess(?) riding a Minoan Dragon.
- 129B. Seal Impression from Hagia Triada - LM.  
Minoan Dragon in a Papyrus Landscape.

The best representation is the undated lentoid from Mycenae, 386, where the Dragon carries a female figure over the land. Levi's description, extended by Gill, lists the characteristics of the Minoan Dragon as, an elongated tubular body marked with bands or dots, a tail curling high over the back, stout legs and large paws, a sturdy neck supporting a small head with ears and a beak-like jaw.<sup>9</sup> The Minoan Dragon does not have the horned crown of the Snake Dragon nor its eagle talons for hind limbs. No Mesopotamian deity rides side-saddle on a Dragon. They either stand or are seated on a throne which is placed on the Dragon's back.<sup>10</sup>

---

5. Ibid. p. 169 and Pl. XXVIII m.

6. Ibid. pp. 174-7.

7. STROM 179, FRANK CS p. 256.

8. LEVI (1945). See also POURSAT (1976) for additional examples. LEVI (1945) p. 270 describes "a large paw or claw at the end of the legs", but this is for all four limbs.

9. GILL (1963) p. 2.

10. As in 335 or in FRANK CS Pl. XXI v. This latter seal is perhaps the closest to the Minoan iconography in the second millennium and is illustrated by LEVI (1945) Fig. 3 for comparison. Later Babylonian examples are closer in iconographical detail as in the Isthtar Gate Dragons STROM XLIV, 277, but they are inadmissible as prototypes as they date from the 6th century. GILL (1963) p. 4 suggests that the Goddess would ride in the manner of Cretan women.

Other Aegean motifs which have been called Dragons differ from the Minoan Dragon in iconographical detail and have much more in common with the crocodile as Poursat has noted.<sup>11</sup>

130. Gold Ornament from Mycenae - LHI.  
Minoan Crocodile.<sup>12</sup>

The thickness of the tail and the absence of clearly defined legs which give a statant posture are the features which differentiate this creature from the Minoan Dragon. Spots also mark the Crocodile skin.<sup>13</sup>

131. Ivory Comb from Thebes - LHIII B.

This damaged piece could be a representation of a Crocodile tail.

The Crocodile has been known in Egyptian art since Old Kingdom times where it is depicted naturalistically in river and swamp scenes. In the other usage in Egyptian art, the Crocodile is removed from its Nile habitat and associated with Egyptian deities as in the designs with Thoueris 133, 141 and 142. The motif is known at Byblos in the Middle Bronze Age from Thoueris figures with Crocodile capes as in 134 and in a relief design.<sup>14</sup>

As far as the few Aegean examples can indicate, there are some parallels in iconographical detail between eastern and Aegean examples of Dragon and Crocodile motifs. With the Crocodile the general shape and a stance low on the ground and perhaps the spotty skin could be seen as indicating the reptilian features of the Crocodile. With the Dragon the similarity of the Minoan dragon to

11. POURSAT (1976). He notes also p. 468-71 that Marinatos earlier likened one example to a crocodile.

12. For Minoan and other Mainland examples see POURSAT (1976).

13. One Dragon example has a spotted skin also. POURSAT (1976) Fig. 6.

14. BYB. D 15462. Limestone rod from the Offering Deposit, Temple of the Obelisks. Designs show a lion, leopard(?), and crocodile. See also below p. 59, Thoueris.

the Snake Dragon of Mesopotamian tradition can be seen in the over-all shape and the fact that it carries an anthropomorphic figure, and perhaps in the spotty or banded skin.

The eastern example closest iconographically to the Minoan Dragon is a mythological group from the 3rd millennium.

132. Alabaster Group from Tell Asmar - Imp. Akk.II-III. The shape of the creature, its scaly skin and the fact that it carries a deity side-saddle are details which relate this motif to the Minoan Dragon. The only problem is that it is about 700 years before the Aegean examples with nothing similar in between.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Thoueris and the Minoan Genius

Thoueris, the hippopotamus goddess of Egypt, is known from Old Kingdom times but the clearest statement of the iconographical details is given in the examples from Dynasty XVIII.

133. Painted Ceiling from Deir el Bahari - Dyn. XVIII.  
Thoueris with Crocodile Cape.  
This example from Senmut's tomb gives the classic representation of the goddess. It has the hippopotamus shape but upright human pose, pendulous breast, "cape" down the back with crocodile superimposed, attributes of sword and small crocodile. A simpler form of Thoueris is known from amulets from Dynasty VI and one with a "plaited" cape minus crocodile from Dynasty XII.<sup>1</sup>

In Middle Kingdom times the Thoueris is known also in Syria at Byblos.

134. Figurine from Byblos - 18th C.  
Thoueris with Crocodile Cape.  
This is one of many examples from the Temple of the Obelisks, contemporary with Dynasty XII.<sup>2</sup>  
The crocodile cape is clear but the feet have already become human with toes indicated.

In the Aegean area the Thoueris form is known from a find in a Mesara tholos.

135. Scarab from Platanos in an EMII-MMII context, Egyptian Import.<sup>3</sup>  
Thoueris with Crocodile Cape.  
Opinion has varied on the context of this piece and on whether it is an import or not. The rendering of the hippopotamus and crocodile forms suggest a hand not really familiar with Nile water life.

- 
1. PETRIE (1914), Taurt 236, p. 47 and Pls. XL, XLV.  
Additional Middle Kingdom examples on amulets, hair pins, and a scarab are listed in HAYES (1953) pp. 226-7, 237-40, 248-9 and Fig. 159.
  2. BYB.D 15121-15152, thirty-two in hippopotamus animal pose; 15153-15161, nine in the hippopotamus Thoueris form but some of them with the simple cape. Thoueris is also found on two cylinders, BYB.D 12936, 11464.
  3. Evans PMIV p. 439 FN2 explains that he originally considered it a Minoan imitation but has changed his mind to acknowledge it of Egyptian fabric. In FN3 he suggests the small figure behind is that of a monkey, but surely it must be an imperfectly rendered crocodile. Another possibility is that the scarab could have been imported from Syria, which could also explain the debased iconography.

In Old Palace art a motif appears which shares many iconographical details with the Thoueris figure of the Egyptian tradition. Sir Arthur Evans named the motif of the Minoan Genius<sup>4</sup> and believed it to be a derivation of the Egyptian hippopotamus goddess.<sup>5</sup> More recently Gill has shown that the Old Palace examples are very close in iconography to Thoueris and that the changes in shape occur in Late Minoan art.<sup>6</sup>

136. Amygdaloid Seal - LMI.

Minoan Genius with Ewer.

When in LM times the Minoan Genius emerges from the Thoueris chrysalis, the transformation is remarkable. The upright posture remains, but the body is now more leonine, the pendulous breast and protruding belly have disappeared to be replaced by the neat waist and cinch belt of the Minoan male. The cape remains as a dorsal appendage very like the original plaited form.<sup>7</sup> The Genius holds a ewer of peculiarly Minoan shape which is also known as a symbol of the hieroglyphic script in Crete. The ewer remains a characteristic feature.<sup>8</sup> An extra interesting detail in this example is the row of spirals down each side "signifying flowing water".<sup>9</sup>

137. Lentoid Seal - Neo-Palatial.

Minoan Genius with Bull over Shoulder.

This example shows the regular Genius form with an acceptable variant to the cape - a widened version like a shell, also nipped in at the waist. For the "animal over shoulder" compare 73 Hero with Griffin, and 79, 80 Mistress with Animal. These animals however appear alive whereas the bull in 137 is dead.

- 
4. The Minoan Genius has many names, some used as alternatives by Evans - Minoan Demon, Ta-Urt Demon, Daemon, Lion-headed Demon - but this thesis has preferred Evans' original name. It is short, shorter than most of Evans' coining, and it does not bring confusion to the term "demon" which signifies a hybrid, animal head, human body, PORADA (1948a) p. XXIV. Unfortunately we do not know what the Minoans called their creature.
  5. Evans discusses the relationship at length. PMI pp. 199-200; PMIV pp. 430-67.
  6. GILL (1964) and (1970) gives a full commentary on the iconography with many additional examples. The example from the Phaestos Palace shows a Genius holding a ewer which sprouts a palm frond, illustrated CMS II.5 321.
  7. PETRIE (1914) Dynasty XII example 263g. Pl. XL.
  8. The ewer may be a continuation of an indigenous Minoan tradition going back to EM II with the "Myrtos goddess", WARREN (1972a) Pl. 70.
  9. Kenna's interpretation CMS XII p. 306 with which I agree.

138. Hydria from Kourion - LMI.  
Minoan Genii with Ewers.  
These Genii show the widened cape but no Minoan belt.<sup>10</sup>
139. Amygdaloid Seal from Hydra - LMIB.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Heroes subdue a Genius in a variant of the Master of Animals motif.<sup>11</sup> He has the belt and narrow cape but a head more like a donkey's. From this period come the other Antithetical Group examples; 68A where the Genii are the animals subdued at the tongue, 63B where the adoring Genius has wings as well, a singular occurrence.
140. Amygdaloid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
Minoan Genius with Ewer.  
This genius is of the leonine type, with neat waist and widened cape. On a gem from the same tomb, 162, an Antithetical Group example shows two ewer-holding Genii about a Foliate Symbol mounted on Sacral Horns and an Altar. The seal 140 appears Minoan in style, the seal 162, Mycenaean.

In the 14th and 13th centuries the Egyptians continue to depict Thoueris and the Mycenaean continue using the Minoan Genius motif.

141. Painted Ceiling Thebes - Dyn. XIX.  
Thoueris with Crocodile Cape.  
This design with astronomical details may copy the earlier example, 133.
142. Wall Painting, Deir el Medineh - Dyn. XIX.  
Thoueris with Ankh.  
An example with no sword and showing the simplified "plaited cape" without the crocodile.
143. Signet Ring from Tiryns - Undated.  
Minoan Genii in Procession.  
This is perhaps the most famous representation of the motif. The four Genii have the neat waist, belt, widened cape and hold the ewer. As they process towards the seated figure they are separated by foliate symbols which appear again in the sky beside a Crescent and a Star Disk. These are the same foliate symbols which appear in the early Phaistos example both behind the Genius and sprouting from the ewer.<sup>12</sup>

10. Another bronze hydria PM IV Fig. 381 also shows Genii though I am not sure that Evans' suggestion p. 457 of a link with crocodiles for the background is correct. See also the original publication MARKIDES (1911-12).
11. Above 68A. These details and their treatment are Mycenaean in style rather than Minoan.
12. Above p. 60, F.N. 6. For the Star Disk and Crescent see below p. 116.

144. Cylinder Seal from Kakovatos - Undated.  
Minoan Genius Watching a Duel.<sup>13</sup>  
The Genius appears to be protecting the warrior in his struggle.
145. Carved Figure from Pylos - LHIII B.  
Minoan Genius.  
No doubt the Genius in this ivory originally held the ewer.
146. Lentoid Seal - LHIIIA/B.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Minoan Genii about a Sacred Pillar.  
In this degenerate example the narrow cape has become a detached train. Compare the earlier LMIB seal 168 where the Genii are bird-like rather than leonine. The debasement of the iconography may result from careless workmanship or may indicate that the seal carver does not fully understand the motif.
147. Sealing from Pylos - LHIII B.  
Double Antithetical Group: Mistress of Animals.  
Two Minoan Genii and Two Bulls about a Goddess in a Snake Frame Headdress.  
Though this sealing is damaged, the Genius clearly shows a head of the elongated donkey type. Again a foliate motif is carried by each attendant Genius. The attendant role is reversed in 74 where the Genius is Master.
148. Fresco Fragment from Mycenae - LHIIIA.<sup>14</sup>  
Three Minoan Genii carrying a pole over their shoulders. Here is one of the standard types - belt, widened cape, donkey head. The pole is probably for carrying game which in other examples is carried directly on the shoulder as in 137 and comparisons. The colour of the genius is white with cape rendered in marbling of blue, red, yellow and white. The curl on the forehead was seen in example 136.

The above survey of the Thoueris motif shows it used in Egyptian art from the Old Kingdom to the end of the Late Bronze Age with the same assemblage of iconographical features. It has a hippopotamus body, upright stance, plaited or crocodile cape, and may be seen holding a crocodile or sword. The motif is also known from isolated examples from Syria and Crete of a time contemporaneous with Dynasty XII.

---

13. Below p. 121.

14. There is some discussion about the date. MARIN p. 176 "It was in a private house at Mycenae and is of the latest period". Lang, PNII p. 224 thinks it possible this is one of the very few pre-LHIII frescoes on the Mainland.

The Minoan Genius appears in Minoan art during the Old Palace Period. It has a body with some hippopotamus features but in some examples looks rather leonine. It has upright stance, a knobbed dorsal appendage more like a shell than a cape, and is associated with various human figures, animals, and religious symbols. The Mycenaeans take over the Minoan Genius mostly on small scale items like seals. They do not change any iconographical details or add any of their own except perhaps slightly to elongate the snout to give a more donkey-like face marking a further degree of removal from the hippopotamus form. Nor do they change the usage of associated motifs. The Minoan Genius, though used by the Mycenaeans as one of their motifs retains its Minoan form till the end.

In comparing the two motifs, Egyptian Thoueris and Minoan Genius, it must be recognized that as far as iconographical detail is concerned any Egyptian element is very much re-worked. Minoan male attire modifies the swelling animal shape to the neat belted-form of the Minoan Genius. In addition the cape is of two types, narrow and widened like a shell with two humps, the constriction necessary to match the neat Minoan waist. In the matter of associated motifs, the Minoan and Mycenaean people, the attendant animals, the ewer, the foliate motifs, the Sacred Horns, altar, and Sacred Pillar, the Egyptian element is non-existent unless one allows a faint memory of the river origin in the carrying of water ewers.<sup>15</sup> As for the Minoan and Mycenaean figures, the Minoan Sacred Horns and Altar, the Sacred Pillar, they can safely be attributed to an indigenous Aegean

---

15. For a discussion of significance of the motif and of Evans' claims for further Thoueris-Genii astral associations etc. see the section on the Acceptance and Rejection of Motifs, Chapter 9.



tradition. The animal associations which fall into the Antithetical Group and Master of Animals motifs have parallels in the Mesopotamian tradition not the Egyptian. The "animal over the shoulder" is probably an Aegean creation though it too can be compared to the power over animals theme exhibited by Master, Mistress and Demon figures of the Mesopotamian tradition. The shape of the ewer is distinctively Minoan but there are iconographical antecedents in the Mesopotamian tradition for water vessels associated with foliate motifs. The Flowing Vase 12, and the ritual watering of foliate symbols 11 and 152A,<sup>16</sup> are strong motifs particularly at 18th Century Mari.<sup>17</sup>

---

16. Below pp. 66-8.

17. Particularly in the large scale wall paintings the Investiture, STROM 165, where a branch grows up from the vase; Register IV in Room 132, PARR 348A; and in the statue of the Water Dispensing Goddess with its elaborate arrangements, STROM 162, 163 and p. 420. GILL (1964) shows a sprouting vase and a flowing vase held by Genii in her illustrations of the early sealings, Beilage I, 1 and 2. See also above pp. 60-1.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Sacred Tree, Sacred Pillar

Trees, boughs and flower sprays find a place in the arts of many peoples and many periods. They are part of Mesopotamian iconography from the earliest times and though one always suspects a religious underlay in all these early depictions, there is often no unequivocal indication of their being sacred symbols. However in many regularly recurring depictions a foliate symbol appears as the focus of an animal group or a ritual. The title "Sacred Tree" which has been widely, if loosely, used for many years is used here in the restricted sense of describing the foliate symbol which is the focus of such a group or ritual. Frankfort realized the problems inherent in any undefined use of terms and wished to restrict the use of "Sacred Tree" to those designs following in the wake of the Mitannian incursions, those "artificial creations" which are "the central feature of a definite ceremonial".<sup>1</sup> It seems better to leave the term Sacred Tree as the overall title and then proceed to discuss under its generic headings all the sub-classes and usages found in ancient art of which the Mitannian Tree would be one. Thus the term Sacred Tree here would encompass Frankfort and Porada's Sacred Tree, Buchanan's Tree and Ornamental Tree and Amiet's Rameau.

Now the particular iconographical details which will be discussed here concern two usages of the Sacred Tree motif. They

---

1. FRANK CS pp. 204-5 speaking of the Assyrian seal designs. He does of course recognize another widespread use, "Throughout Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia, and at all times a simple antithetical group of animals flanking a plant is known" but believes that to call this a "sacred tree" is too confusing. I have however argued the opposite.

are the Antithetical Group where the foliate symbol is the focus, and the Tree-watering Ritual where the foliate symbol is carefully watered. The former most often shows two animals flanking (and nibbling at) the tree in which case it has often been called the motif of Animals at the Tree of Life; the latter is more likely to have a stylized or artificial tree which will need further description. Examples 149 to 154B show the Mesopotamian tradition of the Sacred Tree in these two usages and the derivative Asian traditions down to the Late Bronze Age.

149. Cylinder Seal - Uruk Period.

Antithetical Group.

Two Goats statant about a Sacred Tree growing on a Scale Mountain.

On this early seal the regular usage is seen including the details of the Scale Mountain base on which the flanking animals steady their front feet. This usage of the Sacred Tree where the flanking figures are animals is also termed the Tree of Life and constitutes a major sub-division of the Sacred Tree designs.

Examples are 4 and 34.

150. Section of a Stele from Ur - Neo-Sumerian.

Ur Nammu waters a Sacred Tree before Nannar.

This scene is worked a second time on the great stele so the king can worship Ningal also. The artificial arrangement for the Sacred Tree makes it look more like a bough set up in a special container. The water is clearly shown pouring down as in 11.<sup>2</sup>

151. Fresco Fragment from Mari - 18th C.

Antithetical Group.

Two Goats rampant about a Sacred Tree growing on a Scale Mountain.

This later example of the Animals at the Tree of Life faithfully repeats the iconographical details of the animal hooves on the Scale Mountain and the stylized rendering of the Tree.<sup>3</sup>

152A. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.

Subsidiary Motif: Antithetical Group.

Two Goats couchant regardant addorsed about a Sacred Tree. Here the Mesopotamian motif is relegated to a subsidiary position and the Sacred Tree assumes a palm-like shape.

---

2. See Buchanan's discussion of these iconographical details in his description of an unusual seal impression from Ur, BUCHANAN (1972).

3. Stevenson Smith reconstructs a similar design behind the throne of Qatna, SMITH IN Fig. 32.

Apart from the Tree-watering Ritual the Mesopotamian tradition has another motif where a foliate symbol is associated with a vase and water. This Flowing Vase motif, so admirably treated by Elizabeth van Buren,<sup>4</sup> does not necessarily have trees or branches associated. However sometimes the Flowing Vase does sprout a spray or branch as can be seen in Gudea's seal 12. Also at Mari in the Investiture Fresco one large panel is devoted to two Goddesses with Flowing Vases and these vases each sprout a stylized branch.<sup>5</sup>

In the Late Bronze Age eastern art continues to use the Sacred Tree as a focus of the Antithetical Group but the Tree-watering Ritual is not a regularly used motif.

152B. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.

Antithetical Group.

Two Worshippers about a Sacred Tree.

The very artificial Mitannian Sacred Tree is characteristic of the style. Buchanan calls it a Bouquet Tree to indicate the stick-like branches and knob-like leaves or flowers.<sup>6</sup>

153. Sealing from Hattusas - Old-Mid Hittite.

Antithetical Group.

Two Griffins statant elevated about a Sacred Tree.

The animals at the Tree of Life theme with the tree in a very stylized form. Another Hittite seal of the same date, 96, shows Sphinxes statant elevated, about a very stylized Sacred Tree.

154A, Cylinder Seals - Mitannian.

B. Antithetical Groups.

Two Stags/Ibexes statant regardant about a Sacred Tree.

This style is typical of examples in the Common Style of the 16th-14th centuries.

155. Relief Plaque from Alaca Huyuk - Hittite Empire.

Antithetical Group.

Here a curvilinear tree is amalgamated with other symbols.<sup>7</sup>

---

4. VAN BUREN (1933).

5. In the main central section immediately below the panel of the Investiture. The similarity of this detail to the Minoan detail of ewer with branch carried by the Minoan Genius has just been explained p. 64.

6. BUCH p. 182.

7. Below Star Disk in Crescent and Winged Sun Disk, Chapter 3, p. 116.

156. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.  
 Antithetical Group.  
 Animals about a Sacred Tree.  
 The group is not balanced and the Tree is very stylized.  
 Buchanan's term Bouquet Tree would be applicable.  
 Griffins flank the Sacred Tree as in the Hittite  
 sealing 153.

Cypriot seals of the Late Bronze Age show many examples of foliate symbols which closely resemble the elaborate and artificial Sacred Trees of Mitannian art.

157. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - Late Bronze Age.  
 Antithetical Group in Two Registers.  
 The Animals at the Tree of Life theme is shown with trees repeated as well as animals. Other examples are 38 to 40.
158. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - 14th C.  
 Sacred Tree with Sphinx elevated and Winged Human Figure before it.
159. Cylinder Seal from Kourion - Late Bronze Age.  
 Griffin sejant elevated tethered to a Sacred Tree.<sup>8</sup>
160. Cylinder Seal from Hala Sultan Tekke - Late Bronze Age.  
 Row of three Humans interspersed with symbols including a Sacred Tree.

In the Aegean area the use of foliate symbols in religious contexts is well-documented in both Late Minoan and in Mycenaean art. Trees appear to have a sacred character by virtue of their position in apparently ritual procedures and their association with other sacred symbols. Varieties of tree include the pine, cypress, plane, palm, fig and the vine while associated sacred symbols are altars and tables of offering, Sacred Horns and the Double Axe. Sometimes not the whole tree but a branch or bough is shown, and sometimes three sprays or boughs are placed together.<sup>9</sup> These Sacred Tree types are seen in the Mycenaean seals 161, 163, 164.

---

8. CCA3 p. 32. Kenna in his description says a "winged gryphon is in attendance" at a "tree-idol". I believe the leash from neck to tree is quite clear and, bearing in mind the Mycenaean usage I consider this quite a feasible description.

9. EVANS (1901) discusses the use of foliate symbols in Minoan and Mycenaean art. Of the many links he makes covering Asian India to the American Indians and Sumerian times down to 19th century AD Macedonia, only two need be taken up, the "Gilgamesh" link see p. 30 and the "Thoueris" link, see p. 59. WALBERG (1976) treats the iconography of foliate patterns in Kamares designs, pp. 49-50, 65-8 and Figs. 36, 48. See also RUTKOWSKI (1972), p. 203.

161. Lentoid Seal from Rutsi - LHII.  
Woman bringing Lilies to a Shrine.  
The Shrine consists of a Table supporting Sacred  
Horns from which sprout two Olive Sprays.<sup>10</sup>
163. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Cult Scene with Man grasping Sacred Tree.
164. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Cult Scene with Man and Goat before Sacred Tree.  
These two signets show a free treatment of the  
Sacred Tree but there is no doubt of its character  
because it springs up from a sacred base.<sup>11</sup>

Now within this general use of foliate symbols in apparently religious contexts, the Sacred Trees of Aegean art, there are examples of the Antithetical Group with a Sacred Tree as focus and the Tree-watering Ritual. In the Mycenaean example 162 both usages have been telescoped into one design.

162. Lentoid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Minoan Genii with Ewers about a Sacred Tree.  
The Sacred Tree here consists of an Aegean Altar  
supporting Sacred Horns from which sprout three  
Leaf Sprays.<sup>12</sup> It is composed of Aegean religious  
symbols but behaves iconographically just like the  
Sacred Trees which form the focus of Antithetical  
Groups in art. As far as tree-watering ritual is  
concerned, the only distinctive Mesopotamian feature  
that has been omitted is the flowing water. All other  
elements of the Mesopotamian design are there but  
rendered in Aegean terms. The base for the Sacred  
Tree is now composed of Aegean sacred symbols, the vase  
is now the Aegean ewer, and the performer of the ritual  
is not the Mesopotamian King but a Minoan Genius who  
finds this one of his regular roles.<sup>13</sup> Comparison  
should be made to the Genius in 136 where spirals of  
flowing water from the ewer frame his figure.

---

10. Such is the description given CMS I p. 315, but I would suggest that the foliate symbol might be instead a pair of lily plants (the leaves would still be appropriate) and that the woman is in the act of plucking the flowers from the two plants. For men plucking the branches of trees see 163 and 378.

11. See also EVANS (1901) pp. 14-20.

12. Leaf sprays and ewers are regular features of that class of Minoan gems called by Kenna the talismanic stones. Their free treatment iconographically puts them outside the classification here but see KENNA (1969).

13. See above Minoan Genius pp. 60-4 especially for the Phaistos sealing which shows this was the original role of the Genius. In that example the palm fronds in the ewer match the stylized branches of these eastern examples.

Another example of an Antithetical Group with foliate symbols mounted on a base is 43 and the association of ewers with foliate symbol is seen in 143.

In the Aegean the 14th and 13th centuries saw a continuation of Sacred Tree types with Mycenaean art favouring the Antithetical Group rendering.

- 165. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHIII.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Goats statant regardant about a Sacred Tree.  
The Sacred Tree has the tripartite arrangement for foliage.
- 166. Lentoid Seal from Pylos - LHIII.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Goats rampant about a Sacred Tree.  
A very stylized Tree, so much so that it resembles a pillar sprouting three leaves.  
Other Antithetical Group designs featuring Sacred Trees for this period are 29, 41, 104 and 183.

The highly stylized tree of 166 may represent a telescoping of the Sacred Tree and the favourite Aegean motif, the Sacred Pillar.<sup>14</sup> There are also many examples where, iconographically, the Sacred Pillar provides a substitute for the Sacred Tree as the focus of an Antithetical Group in Minoan and Mycenaean art.

- 167. Wall Relief from Knossos - Neo-Palatial.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Griffins<sup>15</sup> tethered to a Sacred Pillar.  
The Pillar is obviously intended to represent an architectural member of the Palace.
- 168. Lentoid Seal - LMIB.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Minoan Genii about a Sacred Pillar.  
This is a debased rendering of the Genii. The Pillar shows, if somewhat sketchily, the diagonal striations which often decorate Aegean columns.
- 169. Lentoid Seal - LHIIb.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Lions rampant about a Sacred Pillar.

---

14. See EVANS (1901) particularly pp. 3 and 45-54, and his note of the unusual cylinder with five pillars in Fig. 24.  
(Now illustrated in CMS I 107.)

15. PMIII Fig. 355. This is a reconstruction so I have not attempted to describe pose in detail. Only pieces of the Griffins, cord, pillar and capital remain.

- 170. Lentoid Seal - LHIIIA/B.  
Griffin statant elevated tethered to a Sacred Pillar.
- 171. Sealing from Mycenae - LHIII.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Cows couchant about a Sacred Pillar  
Two Doves(?) close above.  
This time the Pillar supports Sacred Horns.
- 172. Signet Ring from Prosymna - LHIII.  
Antithetical Group.  
Two Griffins sejant elevated about a Sacred Pillar.  
Companion pieces to this design are 25 and 42.  
The Lion Gate at Mycenae 46 is similar in design  
with Lions replacing the Griffins. Another large  
scale example is the Pylos fresco.<sup>16</sup>

The Sacred Tree motif is widely used in all traditions with great variation in iconographical detail. However there are two specific usages of the motif where there are parallels in iconographical detail in both eastern and Aegean art in the Bronze Age. One is the Antithetical Group with the Sacred Tree as focus and the iconographical detail is particularly close when the attendant figures are animals in Heraldic Poses and the motif of Animals at the Tree of Life is rendered. The second is the Tree-watering Ritual where the iconographical detail also shows quite close correspondence between the Aegean and eastern examples. It is also of interest to note that the Aegean symbol, the Sacred Pillar, fits conveniently into the iconographical formulas regularly employed for the Sacred Tree motif.

---

16. PNII pp. 101, 113. In Hall 46 a Tree of Life or a Pillar appears to be the focus of heraldically placed lions and Griffins. This also appears now to be the case with the Knossos throne room where palm trees sprang from behind the throne and were flanked by Griffins, CAMERON (1970) p. 163.



## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Palm, Palmette

In ancient art the palm tree may be depicted in a naturalistic way but it is more likely to be drawn in a somewhat stylized manner, its trunk a thin vertical cylinder and its fronds sprouting in an even curve at the top. Its derivative form, the Palmette, takes the curve of fronds and even more carefully arranges them into a fan-shaped leafy pattern. Sometimes the tree trunk is added back to the Palmette in which case a Palmette Tree is formed, and sometimes the Palmette is repeated to form an all-over design, the Palmette Pattern.

Both motifs are known in Egyptian art, the Palm from Pre-Dynastic times on a palette<sup>1</sup> and the Palmette from Middle Kingdom times in ceiling and wall designs.<sup>2</sup> Certainly the Palm was used as a shape for pillars and their capitals from the Old Kingdom as in 173.

173. Palm Capital, Abusir - Dyn. V.  
A stone version of the wooden capital.  
This is the standard type and is seen again in the painted pillar in the Dyn. XVIII example 142.  
Palmette designs are shown in the Dyn. XVIII example 293.

Mesopotamian art knows the Palm from very early glyptic<sup>3</sup> and tries to render it naturalistically as in 33 but does not turn it into a major design. Syrian art however does take it up as is seen in Old Syrian seal designs.

- 174A. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Palmette Tree and other designs.  
A very stylized example with an Egyptian cast to most figures. The free form of the palm in 313 provides a contrast.

- 
1. On a cosmetic palette. LANGE 3.
  2. SMITH OK p. 243. From tombs at Qau, Meir, Assiut.  
SMITH AA pp. 52, 117.
  3. AMIET. Seven examples (one doubtful) are given, 387, 587(?), 672, 1139, 1163, 1346, 1482.

## 174B. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.

Triple Palmette Tree.

Buchanan calls both 174A and B ornamental trees.

The two strongly curved lower fronds are a distinctive detail. The Palm used as a Sacred Tree in 152A does not show such extreme curvature.

The first depictions of the Palm and Palmette in the Aegean occur in MMII. It is not known whether palms grew in Crete in ancient times and thus provided a local model though they do grow wild in a few areas in the island today.<sup>4</sup> There appears to be some confusion about the species of palm, whether it is the date producing palm *Phoenix dactylifera* or a Cretan endemic *Phoenix Theophrasti* which has inedible fruit. If it is the latter endemic species then it is most likely that these palms grew in ancient Crete and the fact that Palms in Minoan art do not show the ripened fruit would be explained.<sup>5</sup>

## 175. Large Jar from Knossos - MMII-III.

Palm Tree.

This example of the Kamares Style should be compared to the Syrian forms 174A, B for comparison of the patterned look with lower fronds curled.

Wallberg illustrates such an example with one more frond each side among other Palm forms.<sup>6</sup>

- 
4. HOOD and WARREN (1965) p. 181 n. 64. "These seem to be date palms (*Phoenix dactylifera* L.) which are usually thought to have been introduced into Crete from Asia or Africa early in Minoan times..."
  5. But not the meaning of po-ni-ki-jo in the tablets from Knossos. MURRAY and WARREN (1976) pp. 56-7 suggest that po-ni-ki-jo may mean red, or red dye, or a red dye plant related to the meaning red in the Greek φοιν-. They argue strongly against the proposal of J. Melena that po-ni-ki-jo means dates and is related to the Greek φοινικια (also Appendix I). Their discussion on date palms pp. 45-7 brings out many points pertinent to problem of the origin of the Palm motif in Minoan art. The points include the complete absence so far of date-stones from Minoan or Aegean Bronze Age settlements, the identification of the Cretan date palms as *Phoenix Theophrasti* by W. Greuter, and Evans' comments on the depiction in Minoan art of palms lacking ripened fruit.
  6. WALBERG (1976) in a full discussion of Kamares ware lists the Palm and Palmette motifs under her Antithetic Spiral heading, pp. 49, 67, Figs. 36, 48, a terminology which stresses the curled fronds but which does not do justice to the foliate nature of many of the designs.  
FURU pp. 121-31, pp. 134-43, and PMII pp. 493-7 including Fig. 301. Some Pre-Palatial seals bear palm-like leaf patterns.  
CMS II.1 101, 194, 242, 255.

In the Late Bronze Age the Palm and Palmette continue in use in the East with the Palmette in particular being drawn in more and more elaborate forms.

179. Cylinder Seal from Tripoli - 1450-1360.  
Palmette Tree and other Motifs.  
This example shows the elaborate Palmette form favoured in Mitannian and Middle Assyrian glyptic. Examples 35 and 156 are Palmette Trees in the Mitannian style used as Sacred Trees.  
Example 120 is another Syrian Seal with elaborate Sacred Tree containing Palmette elements. Each of these three shows a different degree of removal from the clear Palmette form of 179.
180. Cylinder Seal - 14th-13th C.  
Palm Tree and other Motifs.  
An example of how sketchy the motif can become in late 2nd millennium seal designs.  
The usage in Cyprus is often sketchy also as in the Palmette Trees of 122B, 158 and 272.  
Better Cypriot examples of the Palmette Tree include 39, 40, 157, 159, 160.

In the Aegean in the first part of the Late Bronze Age examples of the Palm motif are known from Crete, Thera, and the Mainland. In the 14th and 13th centuries Mycenaean art continues to use both the Palm and Palmette motifs extensively.

176. Side of a Box from Mycenae - LHI.  
Attack Theme; Palms in Background.  
A Shaft Graves example with palm-like elements.  
Tri-partite palm fronds are also used as a base for animals in 50B and C.
177. Amygdaloid Seal - LMI.  
Palm Tree.  
A natural tree.
178. Fresco Fragment from Thera - LMIA.  
Man beside a Palm Tree.  
This Palm compares well with the shape in 175 but it should also be contrasted with the more naturalistic rendering in the landscape scene from the West House.<sup>8</sup>
181. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - LHIII.  
Bull statant regardant in front of a Palm Tree.  
This palm is very like the one on the earlier Vaphio cup 363, and should also be compared to the Cypriot example 38.

---

7. FRANK CS pp. 184-5 Mitannian Palmettes.  
pp. 186-8 Middle Assyrian Palmettes.

8. THERA IV. Colour Plate 8 West House, Room 5,  
Sub-Tropical Landscape.

182. Floor Design, Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Palmette Patterns.  
 The top left hand and bottom right hand sections contain highly stylized Palm Patterns which have close parallels with the earlier Egyptian design 293.
183. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Triple Palmette Tree.  
 In this late example the Antithetical Group has as its focus Palms more like the pottery patterns.
184. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
 Palm Designs on Mycenaean Pottery.  
 Furumarks' Motif 15, Palm II, shows the further stylization of the motif to be expected in LHIII ware.

The two motifs Palm and Palmette are well developed in Egyptian art by the end of the Middle Kingdom and Syrian glyptic would appear to take the motifs over from this area and not from the slight Mesopotamian usage. Aegean art begins to use the motifs extensively on pottery in MMII and III, and they reappear in LM and LH times on pottery, seals and frescoes. Their use continues in all these areas and Cyprus as well till the end of the Bronze Age.

The co-incidence of iconographical detail is noticeable in the stylized and patterned forms of the Palm motif in Aegean and eastern examples. This is particularly the case when the curled lower fronds and the fan of pointed fronds in Syrian and Aegean examples are compared. However the elaborate Palmette Trees found on Mitannian, Middle Assyrian, and Syrian seals do not find parallels in the Aegean.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Papyrus, Lotus

In eastern art the origin of this motif is not contested: the papyrus plant belongs to the marshes of the Nile and the Papyrus motif begins in Egyptian art. In the Old Kingdom its three main uses are firmly established, namely the naturalistic form for reliefs and wall paintings of swamp scenes, the rather more stylized forms for symbolic use as in the plant for Lower Egypt, and its functional use in architecture. In this latter role the natural plant form is transferred to stone. The Papyrus column may take the form of a single plant with open flowers as the capital as with the engaged columns at Saqqara<sup>1</sup> or in later examples of a bundle of plants usually with buds forming the capital as at Luxor.<sup>2</sup> Other New Kingdom examples of columns depicted in tomb paintings are illustrated in 142<sup>3</sup> and 193. Apart from these architectural examples, the naturalistic and the stylized Papyrus forms are seen in 185 and 186.

#### 185. Wall Relief, Saqqara - Dyn. VI.

Papyrus in a Marsh Scene.

This example shows the classic representation.

The plant is shown in elevation: the stems more triangular in section than round, the calyx with five sepals but three marked more strongly, the corolla fan-shaped with vertical striations and a clear demarcation at the upper edge.

This form is used for the hieroglyph "waz" and colours are green for stem and fan, pink for calyx (and leaves at base of stem), and yellow for demarcation of the upper edge.<sup>4</sup>

- 
1. MICH 60 Saqqara. Slender Papyrus half-columns. North House of the Zoser Funerary Complex.
  2. LANGE 159 Temple of Amon-Mut-Khons. See also MICH Chart XI p. 578.
  3. This is a poor representation and a Palm capital may be meant.
  4. SMITH OK. Plate A includes this hieroglyph in colour. GARDINER (1950) pp. 480-1 gives all the hieroglyphic forms of the Papyrus, M 13-6.

186. Design on Throne of Cephren - Dyn. IV.  
Papyrus and Upper Egypt Plant in the Symbol of Union.  
The Papyrus, though stylized, shows the characteristic fan shaped corolla while the Upper Egypt Plant<sup>5</sup> has a corolla with three segments. Later designs give the outer two segments of the Upper Egypt Plant a more voluted appearance.  
The Union Symbol of the Middle Kingdom 391 and of the New Kingdom 250 reveal this.  
All these examples come from the side of the king's throne.

It is not surprising that such a widely used Egyptian motif should by the 18th century be seen as far afield as Byblos and Mari.

187. Mirror Handle from Byblos - 18th C.  
Mirror with Papyrus Handle.  
This piece is very true to the naturalistic Egyptian representation (the upper edge of the fan may be a little too wide) but is thought to be local work.<sup>6</sup>
188. Ivory Plaques from Byblos - 18th C.  
Papyrus Ivories.  
Here the upper edge of the fan has been extended to form two graceful curves. Other pieces showing these curves further extended suggest this may be a misunderstood Union symbol.
189. Wall Painting from Mari - 18th C.  
Artificial Tree with Papyrus Flowers.  
This example takes the Papyrus right away from its original reed-like character.

In the Aegean the Papyrus motif is depicted in Minoan art from MM times but it is not known whether the papyrus grew in Crete in the Bronze Age. The papyrus is not found in its natural state in the Aegean today but it does grow wild near Syracuse in Sicily. A cultivated example is however to be found growing in a garden in Hania.<sup>7</sup>

- 
5. Ibid. pp. 36-7. Sedge-like nature of the Upper Egypt Plant. For a Syrian adaption see 448. For the hieroglyphic forms see GARDINER (1950) pp. 482-3, M22-8.
6. BYB.M p. 162. Other papyriform ornaments from Tomb II are local work. An ivory plaque, BYB.D Pl. CLXXXVIII. 10534 has a clump of papyrus plants and could be the prototype of the later foliate clumps in landscape compositions.
7. WARREN (1976) argues strongly against the view that papyrus was never grown in the Aegean area.

Example 190 may be an early representation of the Papyrus but the motif comes into regular use in Kamares designs when new elements are added to the pure Papyrus form. Furumark lists "foliate stalks, side petals, and circular elements inside and at the upper margin of the tuft".<sup>8</sup> These new elements apparently come from hybridization with local plant forms.<sup>9</sup>

190. Discoid Seal - MMI.  
C Spiral with Papyrus inset.<sup>10</sup>  
In this design the volutes of the Spiral produce the same effect as the extension and curvature of the fan edge in the Byblos example 188.
191. Alabaster Lamp from Knossos - MMIII-LMI.  
The quadruple shaft and open capital based on the plant form follow Egyptian column types.

In the Late Bronze Age Egyptian usage of the Papyrus continues in its traditional ways though there is some relaxation in the observance of formerly precise details even to the addition of "leaves".<sup>11</sup> Syrian art also continues to use the motif.

193. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XIX.  
Papyrus in Ipy's Garden.  
This painting shows a late form in that the calyx now has only three sepals.  
The form of the Papyrus Bundle Column remains standard.
194. Lid of Tutankhamun's Chest - Dyn. XVIII.  
Papyrus and Lotus Bundles.  
A royal piece, this shows the stricter form though there are still only three sepals.

8. FURU p. 138.  
WALBERG (1976) mentions the Papyrus in her comments on C-spiral forms p. 74, but does not show it separately as a Kamares design. However the designs illustrated under Pictorialized Motifs Fig. 48 (i) antithetic spirals 11 and (iii) groups of radiating lines 1, 2, and 3 can all be seen as containing Papyrus elements.
9. See also Evans' discussion of the Papyrus motif, PMII pp. 476-8, which contains a sketch diagram of Papyrus forms MMIIIb to LMIII. For the Papyrus in LMI pottery see POPHAM (1967), Figs. 1, 2.
10. CMS VIII p. 35 suggests the stylized flower may be a Papyrus.
11. See the papyrus plants carried in N.K. tomb scenes, e.g. MICH III, 426, 427, 429.

195. Mirror - New Kingdom.  
Papyrus Handle.  
The Papyrus fan has again been extended but now it complements the form of the female figure.
196. Bed Head Panels from Ugarit - Late 14th - 13th C.  
This Syrian design shows a composite tree one of whose elements is the Papyrus fan. Again, as with the earlier Mari example, the marsh plant has been removed from its natural habitat. Other examples showing this Syrian usage include the "papyrus" in landscape 118, the composite pillar 401, and the Nuzi panels 454.

In the Late Bronze Age Minoan and Mycenaean art both make regular use of the Papyrus motif, particularly in conjunction with other decorative floral elements and the Spiral.

197. Fresco Design from Thera - LMIA.  
Waz-Iris and other Designs.  
The term Waz-Iris is coined here as a parallel to Waz-Lily in order to describe this hybrid where the Papyrus is inserted above the incurving volutes of the iris flower.<sup>12</sup> The incurved form allows the Papyrus stem to be shown also.  
On the top of the poles the Waz-Iris is set on lily volutes<sup>13</sup> but the festoons show the Waz-Iris separate again. Other examples from the same fresco show the more usual Waz-Lily form atop the poles and as festoons.<sup>14</sup>

- 
12. In allowing the origin of the incurving volutes to be the iris, I follow Evans PMII pp. 786-7 and Fig. 513. The full iris flower, seen stylized in profile, has a pair of incurving volutes set upon a pair of out-curving volutes. This full form is probably the source of the pole tops in 197 but it is more convenient to call all out-curving volutes "lily volutes" since most are lilies. See 198. The incurving volutes should be called "iris volutes" instead of "double decorative scrolls" since the former name suggests their origin.
13. It is surely not necessary to propose an Egyptian origin for the lily volutes as does Marinatos with his "Egyptian lily", THERA V p. 41. If by "Egyptian lily" he means the Upper Egypt plant, it has already been shown, p. 80 above, that its form never becomes very voluted and any way there are enough Minoan irises and lilies to provide the volutes without going further afield.
14. THERA VI. Colour Plate 4.  
The other Thera example which should be compared with this stylized example is the naturalistic papyrus plant of the Room of the Ladies THERA V Pls. E, F. Marinatos calls them *Pancratium* lilies, THERA V pp. 38-9. He is wrong in this and his footnote reference to Evans is also incorrect. These plants in size and colour imitate Egyptian renditions of marsh scenes. See 421. See also the later seals 44 and 73. Other papyrus examples come from the "subtropical landscape", THERA VI Colour Plate 8. WARREN (1976) pp. 89-92 in discussing the fresco from the Room of the Ladies, also concludes that the plants illustrated are not *Pancratium* lilies but the papyrus, *Cyperus papyrus*. He also comments pp. 90-91 on the choice of colour depicting the plant.



192. Gold Jewellery from Mycenae - LHI.  
Waz Lilies.  
Two Shaft Graves ornaments show one of the standard Minoan hybrid forms consisting of a Papyrus tuft inserted above the outcurving volutes of a Minoan lily. Evans named this form the "Waz-Lily" to indicate the nature of the hybridization.<sup>15</sup>
198. Gold Necklaces from Prosymna - LHIII.  
Papyrus Beads and Lily Beads.  
These stylized flower forms are a contrast to the attempts at naturalistic Papyrus renderings of the LHII-III seal 44 and the LMIIIA cylinder 73.<sup>16</sup>
199. Fresco Frieze, Tiryns - LHIIIA.<sup>17</sup>  
Running Spiral with Papyrus.  
The Papyrus with three sepals fills the interstices of spiraliform design. A similar use in an all-over pattern is seen in 295.
- 
15. Evans in his discussion of the "Priest King" crown, PMII pp. 775-6. About this design, Furumark makes the comment, FURU pp. 148-9, "... the fundamental motive must be the lily, and the supposition that the solid central part originally represents papyrus does not seem to be sufficiently founded."  
The Thera fresco examples (see 197) would undoubtedly provide enough evidence for Furumark to allow the hybridization. He was always ready to admit that with the "Sacral Ivy" motif its leaves have "the appearance of a papyrus tuft enclosed by a cordiform leaf", FURU p. 40, and finally he includes it in his Papyrus class in the LMIB designs, FURU p. 160.  
He of course rightly rejects Evans' explanation of the Sacral Ivy hybrid, PMII pp. 478-80, and points out the possible evolution of both "ivy" and "papyrus" from the interstices of spiraliform designs. However, the simple explanation of these motifs, i.e. as hybrid forms, seems to me the first step and then one allows that the inventive Minoan artists early recognized the similarities between the crevice shapes in their spiraliform designs and the pointed ivy and Papyrus fan shapes and coalesced the two.  
It should be noted that all the above examples from the Old Palaces or later testify to the Papyrus being a regular motif of Minoan art from MM times. However some Pre-Palatial seals (CMS II.1 110, 145) suggest that the initial usage of the motif may have been earlier in EMIII times.  
LEVI (1964) p. 9 has noted the Egyptian link in the Waz designs on Phaestos sealings.  
The Waz Lily becomes a favourite Mycenaean motif, particularly for jewellery. A fine LHII example from Prosymna is the gold necklace, BLEGEN (1937) Fig. 577. Other jewellery from Prosymna is illustrated 198.  
For the favourite shapes in Mycenaean relief beads see HIGGINS (1961) Fig. 14.
16. Jewellery designs regularly use the Papyrus, Rosette, and Lily forms. See the examples from Knossos, MARIN 120; from Archanes, SAKELLARAKIS (1967) p. 281; from Dendra, PERSSON (1931) Fig. 80.
17. Lang, PNII p. 224, believes all Mainland fresco examples are LHIII except for three.

200. Fresco Frieze, Tiryns - LHIIIA.  
The Composite Floral Band.  
The Papyrus motif with three sepals is the dominant form but Rosettes and suggested ivy and Palm forms also shape the design.  
Another example is the frilly Papyrus on the ivory 30.  
The plant in a similar position in 243 may be a Papyrus or a pancratium lily.
201. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.
202. Furumark's Motive 11 Papyrus shows the designs based on the plant itself and the Waz-Lily. Motive 25 "Bivalve Shell" can be considered a simple Papyrus tuft.<sup>18</sup> Motive 18 Mycenaean III Flower shows a further stylization of Papyrus and other elements to form a set of distinctive linear patterns.  
The stylized Papyrus is also seen on the LMIII Sarcophagus 255.<sup>19</sup>

It would be opportune while discussing the Papyrus motif to turn to a similar design, indeed one that is often confused with the Papyrus, the Lotus.

203. Wall Relief, Bersheh - Dyn. XII.  
Woman Smelling a Lotus.  
The pointed petals of the flower must always be visible, separately drawn, above and between the sepals of the calyx.  
The same natural form is seen in 460.
204. Pectoral from Byblos - 18th C.  
Lotus Column and other Designs.  
This shows the open Lotus as a column capital, a role usually reserved for the Papyrus.  
Lotus buds are used in composite capitals.  
The Lotus has travelled north and the confusion with the Papyrus is already evident.
205. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Man Smelling a Lotus.<sup>20</sup>
206. Cosmetic Spoon - New Kingdom.  
Bowl of a Spoon in Lotus Shape.
207. Cosmetic Spoon - New Kingdom.  
Cosmetic Spoon with Lotus and Papyrus Designs.

- 
18. FURU p. 312 discusses the papyrus derivatives.
19. Another LMIII sarcophagus shows foliate forms compounded out of Papyrus and Palmette elements, MARIN 126. Larnakes from the Mainland also show Papyrus motifs, VERMEULE (1965) Pl. 28.
20. The motif of the Woman Smelling a Lotus is used in the Old Kingdom, the first example being Hetepheres. SMITH OK p. 146 and Fig. 55. The later Syrian example 402 follows this continuous Egyptian tradition. Compare the Mari relief plaque of the Goddess smelling a flower, PARROT (1959) Pl. XV, and the Pylos fresco with the Woman, 403, and the Mycenaean krater with the same motif, KARAGEORGHIS (1957) Fig. 2.

These three Dyn. XVIII examples show that the Egyptians continue to use the Lotus, always carefully showing pointed petals and never confusing it with the fan shaped Papyrus floret. Syrian use is seen in 208 and 402.

208. Sarcophagus from Byblos - 13th C.  
 Lotus Border on Ahiiram's Sarcophagus.  
 This 13th century Byblos example shows the clear Lotus motif. In example 402 the king holds a lotus.

No other examples from further afield are given as the Lotus does not appear as a motif in its own right in Aegean art. There is no stress on separate pointed petals in the floral forms. There is only some amalgamation of the pointed petals with the Papyrus motif.

On the other hand the Papyrus motif is known in both Aegean and eastern art. The papyrus plant growing in the Nile marshlands is the inspiration for many Egyptian art forms and from there the motif spreads to Syria where in Middle Kingdom times designs are known at Byblos and Mari. In these cities the Papyrus finds itself attached to artificial trees and has its fan extended to form volutes as happens also with the Palm and Palmette motifs. In the same period the Papyrus motif is seen in Minoan art but it is not clear whether there were papyrus plants growing in the Aegean to copy. Minoan art uses the Papyrus in conjunction with other motifs in Kamares designs and creates that distinctive Aegean hybrid the Waz-Lily. In LM times Theran frescoes also show a clear usage of the Papyrus both naturalistically and stylized as the Waz-Lily and Waz-Iris. Mycenaean art continues this double usage, in fact favouring the stylized forms and eventually producing its own distinctive ceramic design the Mycenaean III Flower. Perhaps the most interesting iconographical feature of this motif's treatment is that where Asian art attached the Papyrus to trees, Aegean art never did. In fact many Minoan and Mycenaean examples reflect the natural reed form.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Rosette

This motif is the true Rosette, the daisy-like flower seen in plan. Its petals may be pointed or rounded and their number does not seem to matter,<sup>1</sup> but the circular nature of the design with petals radiating out from a centre is the distinctive characteristic of the motif. The Rosette has a long tradition in Mesopotamian art but by contrast Egypt has few examples down to the end of the Middle Kingdom. The Narmer Palette 327 and the Scorpion King's Mace<sup>2</sup> are rare early examples and the hair ornaments of the Lady Senebtisy show a Dynasty XII usage.<sup>3</sup> There are many flower designs in Egyptian art and some of the compound ones have been called Rosettes but they are in fact composite designs like the one in 342<sup>4</sup> from Hetepheres' furniture. The Mesopotamian tradition uses the Rosette from Early Sumerian times both naturalistically and as a separate element in other designs. It is this latter usage which continues and is taken into Syrian art.

#### 209. Cylinder Seal - Early Sumerian.

The Man in the Net Skirt Feeds two of the Sacred Flock with Rosette Branches beside Inanna's Standards.

This naturalistic example where the Rosette is still attached to the boughs from which it grows should be compared to 34 and 10.

- 
1. Usually between 6 and 16 with a preference for 6 or 8. Designs which are simply radiating lines and do not seem to have a floral quality are excluded from the Rosette examples.
  2. MICH 181. Both the Palette and the Mace are included in a group of early Egyptian pieces which have been linked to Mesopotamian art work, EDWARDS (1971) pp. 41-2.
  3. HAYES (1953) Fig. 146. Other examples are noted by SMITH AA pp. 116-7 in his discussion of representations of MK textiles.
  4. Aldred calls it a "Roundel" ALDR p. 131. This pattern is exactly copied on a gold disk from Byblos, BYB.D 16706.

210. Cylinder Seal - Proto-Historic.  
This Jemdet Nasr seal shows the second use of the motif, as a separate element in designs,<sup>5</sup> and also the variation of having the Rosette encircled. Plain Rosettes are used in this way in 1 and 33.<sup>6</sup>
211. Gold Bowl from Ur - Ur I.  
Rosette as the base design.  
This is a standard use for the Rosette motif, and has been known since the 5th millennium in the Halaf bowl 233.
212. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Four Rosettes and other designs.  
This horizontal row should be compared with the other Syrian seals, 94B vertical row of three, 292A two Rosettes and a ringed Rosette, and 313 plain Rosettes.

In the Aegean Crete knows the Rosette from EMII with gold jewellery from Mochlos<sup>7</sup> and in many examples of Pre-palatial seal designs.<sup>8</sup> The usage is extended in MMII times to the pottery where Furumark speaks of the "Kamares rosette"<sup>9</sup> and Walberg includes many examples without specifying them as Rosettes in her Radiating Motifs.<sup>10</sup> On the mainland one of the Sealings from Lerna shows the true Rosette.<sup>11</sup>

- 
5. Classing this usage as a "separate element in design" is not meant to suggest there could not be any symbolism intended. The Rosette may or may not have sacred connotations. However it is not clear in this usage that symbolism is intended as in say, 209 and 34, and consequently one must simply describe the artistic usage.
  6. The Rosette in 33 could be compared to the one used on each side of the Narmer Palette, 327, and on the Scorpion King's Mace.
  7. MARIN 13. One of the three blossoms has its eight petals differentiated into two groups of four, reminiscent of the Egyptian floret 342.
  8. Twenty-two examples from CMS II.1 are listed in the Concordance Vol. II p. 160. Most are dated EMII-MMIIa but some may be as late as MMII.
  9. FURU p. 144 and generally pp. 134-43.  
He reminds us that the ring of petals may be twisted to give a torsional effect to the original static design.
  10. WALBERG (1976) pp. 54-6, Figs. 40-42.  
Of these examples the true Rosette is seen in Fig. 41 (iii) 1-4, 6-12, 14-16, (iv) 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 13, 15, (vi) 2, and in Fig. 42 (vii) 3, 5, 6, (viii).  
The torsional effect referred to by Furumark is covered under Whirling motifs pp. 56-8, Figs. 42.
  11. WIENCKE (1969) Pl. 125, S73.  
The sealings from the House of the Tiles do not show the true Rosette though one design has a radiating motif, HEATH (1958) Pl. 22, No. S63. Middle Helladic Matt-painted Pottery has only two designs which are at all close to Rosette iconography. One is a motif of radiating lines and the other a dot rosette, BUCK (1966) Pl. 44, 122 and 123.

215. Round Seal from Platanos - EMIII-MMII.  
Ringed Rosette.

In the Late Bronze Age in the East Syrian Hittite and Cypriot art use the Rosette regularly and new forms are found in Egypt to extend the sparse earlier usage there.

213. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - 16th-14th C.  
Two Rosettes and other designs.  
This example places a Bucranium above each Rosette.  
The Mitannian examples 111 and 152B show a dot Rosette and a plain Rosette.
214. Seal Impression from Bogazkoy - Middle Hittite.  
Ringed Rosette as a seal centrepiece.
217. Painted Ceiling, Malkata - Dyn. XVIII.  
Rosette Border to a Ceiling Pattern.  
This design is in the Aegean usage as are the other border examples 411, 412.
218. Painted Ceiling, Malkata - Dyn. XVIII.  
Rosettes in Spiraliform Ceiling Patterns.  
Here the Rosette studding the centres of the quadruple Spirals also show the Aegean usage.  
The Rosettes between the horns of the Bucrania are reminiscent of the one on the forehead of the silver Bull's Head rhyton from Mycenae but here the Rosette has been enlarged to fit the space between the horns as if the Aegean use was imperfectly rendered by the hand of someone more accustomed to placing a Sun Disk between Hathor horns. The degenerate Rosette elements in 303 may be a later copy of these types.<sup>12</sup>
219. Section of a Plaque from Megiddo - Hittite Empire.  
Rosettes and other designs.  
The plain Rosette is used as a fill ornament.<sup>13</sup>  
The Rosettes studding the voluted headdress of the Hittite Sphinx, 101, have an Aegean cast.
220. Gold Diadem from Kition - Late Bronze Age.  
Triple Rosettes on a Gold Band.  
This is the Aegean double Rosette further elaborated.  
Other Cypriot examples include the other gold band 40, and the dot Rosettes on seals 84, 85B, 160. Plain Rosettes are seen on the seals 102, 158.
221. Axe Head from Ugarit - 1450 - 1365.  
This example appears to follow the old Syrian usage.  
There are also plain Rosettes on seals 120, 267.

---

12. Rosettes are also found in the Tomb of Surer, SAVE-SODERBERGH (1957) Pl. LXI.

13. The elaborate stellate form above the wings cannot be a Rosette but must be a Star Disk. Compare the seal example 64B.

222. Relief - Dyn. XX.<sup>14</sup>  
 Rosette Medallion round the neck of a Sphinx.  
 The use of the ringed Rosette for such a necklace design is well known in the 14th and 13th centuries in Syria.<sup>15</sup>

In the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age, Minoan art continues to use the Rosette while Mycenaean artists make it one of their favourite designs. It is found in all media, ivory, jewellery, reliefs, frescoes, pottery, as shown in examples 216, 223 to 228.

216. Gold Armlet from Mycenae - LHI.  
 Rosette on a Gold Armlet.  
 From the Shaft Graves, this example with sixteen pointed petals is finely worked.<sup>16</sup>
223. Mirror Handle from Rutsi - LHII.<sup>17</sup>  
 Three Rosettes on an Ivory Mirror Handle.  
 This very careful depiction<sup>18</sup> is a contrast to the sketchy Rosette in the LHII-III seal 170.
224. Gold Necklace from Prosymna - LHIII.  
 Double Rosettes in Gold.  
 This is the perfect example of a regular Aegean variation to the standard Rosette, namely the insertion of a smaller petal upon the larger. Known from Kamares designs<sup>19</sup> the double Rosette continues through Minoan and Mycenaean art till the end of the age.
225. Section of Ceiling, Orchomenos - LHIII.  
 Double Border of Double Rosettes.  
 This example shows a regular use of the Rosette motif in Aegean art, i.e. in a row as a border pattern. An earlier Minoan example is the border 98.

- 
14. The relief itself may date from after c1200 but the parallels listed below confirm the usage before 1200.
15. The pendant from Tomb 21b Lachish, TUFNELL (1958) Pl. 25; 24. Parallels given for Ajjul and Megiddo, p. 82.
16. Another fine early example comes from Prosymna where in LHI strata a "Table of Offerings" has Rosettes on the top, BLEGEN (1937) Fig. 673.
17. MARIN p. 175 dates the mirror to the last burial in tholos tomb 2 at Rutsi c1440. (The c1400 must be a misprint.) The seals associated with the later burials are dated LHII, CMS I p. X and p. 304.
18. Compare the finely carved ivory Rosette with a moveable pistil from Dendra, PERSSON (1931) Pl. XXXIII 6.
19. PMIV p. 132 Fig. 100. On a cup of egg-shell ware, a Rosette patterns the base inside and out and both designs show experiments with an extra layer of smaller petals.

226. Fresco Fragment from Thebes.  
Rosette on a Fresco.  
The use of the motif here as a separate element should be contrasted to its more usual use at this time to stud the centres of spiraliiform designs as in 199, 200, 299.<sup>20</sup>
227. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Furumark's Motive 17 Rosette.
228. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Furumark's Motive 27 "Sea Anemone", which he derives from earlier Rosette forms.<sup>21</sup> This seems an unnecessarily circuitous explanation at least of the forms 43 to 46. These are better classified as Rosettes (43 and 46) and double Rosettes (44 and 45), thus avoiding the inexplicable gap in the Rosette repertoire for IIIB, a time when the Rosette was used most widely in Mycenaean art.<sup>22</sup>

Before summing up the use of the Rosette one further extension of the motif in the Aegean area needs discussion. This is the Triglyph and Half Rosette motif. It consists of an Aegean double Rosette bisected vertically, the two halves separated, then elongated, and the central parting covered by a bar with vertical elements. Seen first in LMI reliefs and frescoes it does not enter the ceramic repertoire till LMII<sup>23</sup> and later becomes well established in Mycenaean art.

229. Frieze from Knossos - LMI-II.  
Triglyph and Half Rosette in Stone.  
This is the motif in its finest form.
230. Fresco Design from Pylos - LHIIIA.  
Triglyph and Half Rosette in Fresco.  
This example shows the variation where the half Rosettes are about a corner pillar as it were.
231. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Triglyph and Half Rosette.  
Furumark's Motive 74.  
Mycenaean stylization is clearly observable.

20. For earlier Minoan examples see the Knossos frescoes PMIII pp. 334-7 running Spiral, and quadruple Spiral PMIII pp. 30-1.
21. FURU, p. 147, p. 282.
22. Ibid. p. 283. Furumark attempts a complicated explanation but the simple reclassification as Rosettes is more convincing. However there will always be a problem in classifying motifs because of their dual character as both floral and marine forms.
23. FURU p. 183.



## 232. Frieze from Tiryns - LHIII.

Triglyph and Half Rosette.

This relief is the most famous example of the motif showing also its most elaborate form. It is echoed in the linear rendition on the Pylos seal 123,<sup>24</sup> and the Tiryns ring 143.

The Triglyph and Half Rosette is a purely Aegean development of the Rosette form. It is in fact so peculiarly Aegean that when other Aegean Rosette details are found paralleled in the eastern traditions before c1200, there is no sign of the Triglyph and Half Rosette.

The Rosette motif is known in some Egyptian examples before the New Kingdom but has a strong tradition in Mesopotamia from the earliest times and in the Aegean from the Pre-Palatial Period. The Mesopotamian tradition uses both the plain and the ringed Rosettes as separate design elements and the usage continues in Syrian art till the end of the 13th century.

The iconography of the Rosette in the Aegean, firstly in Minoan art and then Mycenaean, includes both the above usages but here the motif takes on new forms. The double Rosette is created, and rows of Rosettes frame border patterns, while Rosettes are also used to stud spiraliform designs.

In the Late Bronze Age Egyptian art uses the Rosette motif more extensively<sup>25</sup> and its iconography suggests comparisons with Aegean designs. Cypriot art reveals parallels for the old Syrian usages and the Aegean developments also.

24. PNIII Pl. 170. 2a, b, shows the motif on an ivory plaque from Pylos.

25. Even in works commissioned for Pharaoh. These works usually carried designs fashioned strictly in accordance with traditional Egyptian iconography.  
See the comment on the quality of royal and of private work SMITH OK p. 126.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Quatrefoil

The Quatrefoil, the flower with four petals seen in plan, seems to have its origin in Mesopotamian art as a simplified Rosette. Syria follows this usage. Egypt knows the Quatrefoil both as an element in decorative designs and as the hieroglyphic sign for "wn".<sup>1</sup> In the Aegean it is known at least as early as EMII,<sup>2</sup> and on the Mainland in EHII as well.<sup>3</sup>

233. Section of a Bowl from Arpatchiya - 5th millennium.  
Quatrefoil Pattern on Pottery.

The Rosette is used in the centre and the Quatrefoil as an all-over design round that. A four petalled flower is sometimes used naturalistically as in 149, but gradually the stylized form, the Quatrefoil, becomes the standard type. It may of course be used singly as well as in the all over pattern here.

234. Pendant from Byblos - 18th C.

Quatrefoil Border in Cloisonné.

This Byblos example shows the motif forming a surround to the Egyptian inspired design in the centre of the pendant.

235. Tomb Paintings, Assiut, Meir - Dyn. XII.

Quatrefoil and other designs.

Stevenson Smith notes the new patterns but doubts whether the plant elements came from abroad.

In the later example of Ah-hotep's collar, 312, there are Quatrefoil beads among other "distinctly un-Egyptian designs."<sup>4</sup>

236. Elliptical Seal from Hagia Triada - EMII-MMII.

Quatrefoil Pattern.

While this seal shows the all-over pattern the motif is also used singly at this time in Crete.<sup>5</sup> The motif continues in use in MMII pottery designs.<sup>6</sup>

---

1. GARDINER (1950) p. 484, 42.

2. FURU pp. 123-4.

3. Clay Sealings at Lerna, HEATH (1958) Pl. 20 Nos. S12, S13, Pl. 21 S28. An intermediate example of the Quatrefoil motif between the EHII Sealings and the LHI Shaft Graves goods is the use in MH pottery of a quatrefoil form, BUCK (1966) Pl. 42, 19 and Pl. 44, 124.

4. ALDR p. 202, and SMITH AA p. 117.

5. CMS II.1 92.

6. WALBERG (1976) includes Quatrefoil motifs in her Radiating Motifs, pp. 54-6, Fig. 40 and in the Barbotine decoration, Fig. 49. The examples are Fig. 40 (i) crossing 3, 9, 12 (ii) drawn from the circumference 9, and Fig. 49 Barbotine decoration 13.

In the Late Bronze Age the use of the motif in eastern and Aegean traditions continues with no new iconographical features.

237. Wall Painting from Thera - LMIA.  
Quatrefoil Pattern on Clothing.  
Here the sleeves of a bodice are woven or embroidered in the all-over pattern.
238. Gold Earring from Mycenae - LHI.  
Quatrefoil.  
This Shaft Graves example shows the Quatrefoil worked in a design the same as the broder in the Syrian example 234 above. Another Shaft Graves example shows gold set with rock crystal, 248.
239. Statue from Luxor - Dyn. XVIII.  
Quatrefoil Pattern on Clothing.  
The Goddess Sekhmet has a full dress woven or embroidered in the all-over design.
240. Tutankhamun's Coffin Footplate - Dyn. XVIII.  
Quatrefoil Pattern on Clothing.  
Here another deity has a similar dress to the Goddess in 239 above.  
This material becomes greatly favoured in the New Kingdom and often goddesses and royal women are shown in this rich garb instead of the traditional white robes.
241. Faience Fragment from Byblos - 13th C.  
Quatrefoil Pattern.
242. Rectangular Seal from Pylos - Undated.  
Quatrefoil Pattern.  
This is the seal with the magnificent Griffin, 123. It has on its reverse the all-over design.
243. Section of Sarcophagus from Palaikastro - LMIII.  
Quatrefoil and other designs.  
A row of Quatrefoil is used as a border.<sup>7</sup> As in Mycenaean pottery examples, Furumark's Motive 17 Rosette no. 20 (shown in 227) and his Motive 54 Cross, the Quatrefoil Pattern becomes more and more linear in the Mycenaean way.<sup>8</sup>

The Quatrefoil motif then is used as both a single element in the design and as an over-all pattern in eastern and Aegean art. There appears to be some increase in usage of the motif in the Late Bronze Age, particularly as a depiction of fabric in eastern examples.

---

7. For another sarcophagus example see MAJEWSKI (1964) Pls. 6, 7.

8. FURU pp. 373, 375-6.

This increase in usage is also true of the Aegean area though here the Quatrefoil does not become as popular as it did in eastern, particularly Syrian, art. The contrast between the usage of the Quatrefoil and Rosette motifs in Minoan and Mycenaean art is quite noticeable for the Quatrefoil is used sparingly while the Rosette finds its way into every traceable medium and is used extensively in each.<sup>9</sup>

---

9. If Minoan and Mycenaean fabric did use the Quatrefoil extensively it would only slightly qualify this observation.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Scale Pattern

The Scale Pattern, an all-over design of overlapping arcs, is used in all periods of Egyptian art to represent feathers.

- 244. Wall Painting from Meidum - Dyn. IV.  
Scale Pattern - Geese.  
This shows the wing pattern clearly, the "scales" being just one of the feather forms.<sup>1</sup>
- 245. Wall Relief from Deir el Bahari - Dyn. XVIII.  
Scale Pattern - Royal Vulture.  
Nekhbet is painted with both wing and body feathers as "scales". This regular usage is seen in the Middle Kingdom examples 13, 15.

When the Scale Pattern is taken up in Syria it may be used for rendering feathers but it may simply be used as a decorative pattern.

- 246. Piece of Inlay from Alalakh - 1780-1750.  
Scale Pattern in Ivory.  
A damaged piece.
- 247. Scimitar from Byblos - 18th C.  
Scale Pattern in Niello.  
The dotted scales do not represent feathers in the Egyptian way but Egyptian hieroglyphs are worked on the piece.

In Aegean art the Scale Pattern is known in Minoan art in MMII pottery designs.<sup>2</sup>

In the Late Bronze Age the Scale Pattern is extensively used in the Aegean and the East. An apparently new use of the motif is to depict clothing.

- 
- 1. Mesopotamian art, when it did attempt to show feathering made the feathers more elongated. See the form for Imdugud, PARR 187, 188. An exception is the very patterned "scale" effect on the owls in 395.
  - 2. FURU p. 123 considers the simple Scale Pattern here "a repetition of the festoons bordering a line".  
WALBERG (1976) includes Scale Pattern motifs in her Wavy Lines classification, pp. 59-6, Fig. 44. The category (ii) network 1, 2 and 4 are examples of the Scale Pattern.

250. Wall Relief from Abydos - Dyn. XIX.  
Scale Pattern on Pharaoh's Throne.  
Horus sits on a throne where on the side panels the traditional Union Symbol has been reduced to fit one corner and the remaining area filled with a Scale Pattern. This is also seen in the throne of Sekhmet 239.
251. Wall Relief from Abydos - Dyn. XIX.  
Scale Pattern in Clothing.  
The goddess has a vest of scales.
252. Ball Bead from Alalakh - 1447-1370.  
Scale Pattern on a Gold Bead.  
This bead in cloisonné has its scales set with lapis lazuli and green and yellow stones.
253. Toilet Box - Alalakh - 1350-1273.  
Scale Pattern - Duck.  
This shows the old Egyptian usage as feathers, though there is a dot in each scale as in the Syrian example 247.
254. Sceptre from Kourion - c13th C.  
Scale Pattern.  
This piece of cloisonné work found in Cyprus is difficult to date and place<sup>3</sup> but deserves a mention here because it shows the two uses of the scale pattern, the decorative on the base as with the bead in 252, and the use indicating feathers as with the Egyptian vulture in 245.
248. Dagger Hilt from Mycenae - LHI.  
Scale Pattern - Falcon.  
An example from the Shaft Graves with the motif used in the Egyptian way. The scales are inlaid with lapis lazuli. LMI examples are on fabrics, PMII Figs. 456, 7.
249. Back of a Seal from Rutsi - LHII.  
Scale Pattern.  
The scales are filled with blue paste perhaps to represent lapis lazuli.  
The scale pattern is used for a dress on the LHII seal 339 and the Cypriot Seal, 84.
255. Bath - Sarcophagus from Pachyammos - LMIII.  
Scale Pattern and other designs.
256. Floor Design, Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Scale Pattern and other designs.  
The Scale Pattern is well established in Mycenaean art.
257. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Scale Pattern.  
Furumark's Motive 70 Scale Pattern shows various elaborations including the dotted scale seen above in the Syrian examples 247 and 253.
258. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Scale Patterns.  
Furumark's Motive 42 Joining Semi-Circles and his Motive 44 Concentric Arcs have several subdivisions which are really Scale Patterns.

---

3. Its date is given as late as the 11th Century by Karageorghis, KARA, p. 249, and Vermeule includes it in her examples of Mycenaean jewellery, VERM Pl. XLIV. Higgins also considers it of Mycenaean origin but gives it a 12th Century date, HIGGINS (1967), p. 178. Stylistically it can be placed within the 14th or 13th Centuries and the late date of its context would then be explained by the preservation of an exceptionally rich piece till a later burial. See also Chapter 7.

The Scale Pattern is used in common by many Bronze Age arts. Its early use for rendering feathers in Egyptian art is taken over by Syria which extends its use as a decorative design. The decorative usage is the one regularly employed in the Aegean, in both Minoan and Mycenaean art, the latter using the motif extensively in fresco and pottery designs to the end of the period.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Guilloche, Linked Circles, Quirk

The Guilloche is the motif which looks like a rope or a plait. It may take the form of a simple twist or have many strands and be quite an elaborate knot. It may form a continuous band or border or may be self-ended forming a separate element among other designs. Examples 259 to 265, 267, and 268 show the regular usages in the Mesopotamian tradition and its derivatives from Early Dynastic times down into the Late Bronze Age. The Guilloche is particularly favoured in Anatolia.

- 259. Seal Impressions from Brak - Peripheral ED.  
Guilloche and other designs.  
The simple twist of two strands forms the Guilloche.
- 260. Cylinder Seal - ED.  
Snake Coil and other designs.  
Of the same period as 259 above this design of interlaced snakes is thought to be a precursor of the elaborate Guilloche.
- 261. Vase Fragment from Mari - 3000-2500.  
Guilloche Border.  
The two-stranded twist of 259 is given a more elaborate form. The centre space of each overlap has now become a dot.
- 262. Lamp Cover from Telloh - Neo-Sumerian.  
Snake Coil.  
Similar to 260, the motif is now finely worked in greenish-blue steatite.<sup>1</sup>
- 263. Stamp Seal from Hattusas - Early Old Hittite.  
Guilloche and other designs.  
The two-stranded twist, self-ended, forms the bottom segment of the design.
- 264. Stamp Seal from Hattusas - Old-Mid Hittite.  
A many stranded Guilloche worked in two patterns and self-ended forms the top part of the seal design.  
From the same period the sealing 291 shows the simple Guilloche also in use.

---

1. This example should be compared to the other Mari vases, PARR 168, B.C.D., where a simple twist Guilloche has snake or animal markings. These examples do give credence to the idea of the snake coil origin for the Guilloche. Alternatively the simple Guilloche may be an attempt to show running water. On the matter of snake symbolism and Hittite usage the early article VEN DER OSTEN (1926) is informative, particularly for the survey of examples.



265. Sealing from Hattusas - Old-Mid Hittite.  
Guilloche Border and other designs.  
Here a three-stranded Guilloche forms a plait which gives the border right round the stamp seal design.
267. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Guilloche Borders and other designs.  
Here borders of the two-stranded twist edged with lines.<sup>2</sup> From the same period comes the usage of the self-ended Guilloche as a part border in 152A, 422.
268. Cylinder Seal - Early-Mid Syrian.  
Guilloche and other designs.  
Here an elaborate Guilloche, self-ended by the returning of the many strands, shows the other regular usage besides borders, that of dividing up the seal into sections. There are dots in the interstices of the twists 261. Other examples of the motif on Syrian seals are 3, 48A, 64B, 338.

As the Late Bronze Age progresses the Guilloche continues to be used widely in Syria, in the Hittite lands and is taken up in Cyprus also.

269. Signet Ring from Alaca Huyuk - Hittite Empire.  
Guilloche Border.  
This shows a border similar to 265, except that it has four strands.  
The simple Guilloche is seen again in 307.
270. Circular Box from Alalakh - 1447-1370.  
Guilloche Borders.  
This example shows the simple form of the two-stranded twist. Dots have been added in the interstices as in 261 and 268.
271. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - 1450-1190.  
Guilloche and other designs.  
The motif is two-stranded and self-ended and used in one of the standard Syrian ways to break up the field of the seal design into smaller sections.
272. Cylinder Seal from Kition - LCIIB.  
Guilloche and other designs.  
This is an elaborate self-ended Guilloche as in 268 but it is used vertically.

Before turning to look at the use of the Guilloche in Aegean art it would be well to investigate the usage of that other interlaced and circular motif, Linked Circles.<sup>3</sup> In essence this motif is a series

---

2. BUCH p. 170. "Commonly in Old Syrian seals the Guilloche has linear borders."

3. The term Scroll Pattern is used by Buchanan for this motif but "Linked Circles" is a more accurate description of the pattern.

of circles linked by lines running tangential to the circle. It is found in Syria and adjacent areas from the First Intermediate Period down to the end of the Bronze Age. Numerous examples can be seen on the Scarabs from the Montet Jar,<sup>4</sup> c2130-2040, and examples 275 to 280 show the use on pottery and cylinder seals.

- 275. Zoomorphic Vase from Alalakh - 1595-1447.  
Linked Circles and other designs.  
The circles show a dotted centre. This dot or a smaller concentric circle is a regular element of the motif.
- 276. Sherds from Alalakh - 1595-1447.  
Linked Circles.  
The design below shows two Linked Circle patterns side by side, their link lines running counter to each other. This latter use is a regular one.
- 277A. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.  
Linked Circles and other designs.  
Instead of a continuous pattern this variation has sets of two circles linked by the tangential line. Buchanan calls this a "dotted twist".<sup>5</sup>
- 277B. Cylinder Seal from Alalakh - Mitannian.  
Linked Circles and Fish Design.
- 278A. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.  
Linked Circles and Lozenges.  
Three rows of Linked Circles with their links running counter.
- 278B. Cylinder Seal - Mitannian.  
Linked Circles and Fish Designs.  
The design is similar to 278A.
- 279. Cylinder Seal from Ialysos - Cypriot-Mitannian?  
Linked Circles and other designs.  
The pattern is used vertically.
- 280. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - 1450-1190.  
Linked Circles and other designs.  
The circles are set so close together that the motif could be a Guilloche.<sup>6</sup> Other Cypriot examples include 54 and the degenerate form in 102.  
The Mitannian seal 156 shows a similar usage.

---

4. TUFNELL and WARD (1966) Fig. 2, pp. 183-5. The motif is here termed "Concentric Circles" and it is the most popular design on the seals out numbering the Spirals by nearly five to one.

5. BUCH, p. 184.

6. Kenna's description, "a double row of tubular drill markings two groups of which are joined to form an S-spiral", CCA3 p. 24, unfortunately gives no indication of the true nature of the design.

In the Aegean area there are interlaced linear patterns which share iconographical detail with the eastern Guilloche and Linked Circles. In Crete they are seen in Pre-palatial seals and MMII pottery.<sup>7</sup>

266. Stamp Seal - Pre-Palatial.

Guilloche and other designs.

Three linear designs appear to be somewhat imperfect renderings of the motif. A two-stranded twist forms the border; inside this at the top is a better handled two-stranded twist, self-ended; below this is a two-stranded twist joined at one end to the border at the other ending in a leaf (or snake's head?). This Minoan design provides an interesting comparison to the Hittite use in 263, 264, and 265 above.

On the Mainland there are several band designs in matt-painted MH pottery which are very close if not identical to the simple Guilloche and Linked Circles of the eastern traditions. These are listed by Robert Buch as his motifs 105 to 107, 114 to 116, 119.<sup>8</sup> Such designs continue into LHIIIA and IIIB art.

273. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.

Guilloche.

Furumark's Motive 48 Quirk has some divisions particularly the Band Type 12, 13, 14, which are identical to forms of the simple Guilloche, the double-stranded twist.

They are found only in IIIB.

Furumark's Motive 46 Running Spiral, has some divisions, the Late Type of Band Spiral 35 and 36, which show great similarity to the simple Guilloche designs with dotted interstices. The earlier Thera example 197 and the later double row Running Spiral 301 also show similarities to the Linked Circles forms.

274A. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.

Linked Circles and other designs.

The central band could be a degenerate running Spiral but it could also be the Linked Circles motif. It is after all shown in one of the standard usages for the Linked Circles and Guilloche in Syrian, Hittite, and Mitannian glyptic.

7. PMI Plate IIb is a cup in egg-shell ware of polychrome style. It has three bands of a design like a simple Guilloche and similar to the type listed by Furumark's Motive 48 Quirk No. 5. See FURU p. 360 and below p. 104.

WALBERG (1976) shows similar motifs in the Disc Spiral category, Fig. 38 (i) 6, 7 (iii) 1 and Guilloche and Quirk types in Fig. 39 Spiral derivatives 120, 29-32, 36, 37.

8. BUCH (1966) Pl. 44. A gold ornament from Grave Alpha also shows the Linked Circles motif, MYLONAS (1966) 42.

274B. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.

Linked Circles and other designs.

This design which is so similar to 274A is however far more likely to be a degenerate running Spiral since the whole could be seen as a reduced version of a fresco with a running Spiral dado below. This is probably the case with the design in 366.

The simple Guilloche and the Linked Circles of the eastern traditions are close in detail to the Quirk and related patterns of the Aegean area. The many stranded Guilloche and the elaborate Guilloche knot are found in eastern arts, particularly Hittite art, but not Aegean art. Some motifs on LHIIIB pottery show the detail of the single twist Guilloche. The detail of all these motifs should be compared to that of the next motif, the Spiral.

## Spiral

The simple Spiral is a motif that occurs in many artistic traditions. It can be inspired by the curl of a lock of hair, the tendril of a vine, the coil of a rope, the looping of rolled wire. Egypt knows such simple spirals at all periods and in western Asia they occur sporadically also. However the motifs treated here are the elaborate spiral designs which involve double spiral and interlocking and rapport effects. These spiraliiform designs fall into four basic types; C Spiral, S Spiral,<sup>1</sup> Running Spiral, Quadruple Spiral.<sup>2</sup> These spiraliiform motifs appear in the Aegean area in the third millennium where they are seen in Cycladic examples of EC II date<sup>3</sup> and then in Minoan pottery of late EM II and III.<sup>4</sup> The early Aegean spirals may have antecedents in the European examples of spiraliiform designs which go far back into prehistory. Bük pottery, a Neolithic ware of the Danubian group uses a Running Spiral<sup>5</sup> and even earlier in the Magdalenian period carved bones from the Pyrenees show interlocking Spiral patterns.<sup>6</sup> Metalworking techniques may also have influenced the development of involved spiraliiform designs.<sup>7</sup>

- 
1. When the curve is turned the other way this motif is sometimes termed the Z Spiral.
  2. KANTOR (1947a) outlines these four types.
  3. ZERVOS (1957).
  4. BRANIGAN (1970b) pp. 131-2 believes the Minoan examples derive from the Cycladic.
  5. KANDYBA (1936) discusses the Danubian designs and also POWELL (1966) pp. 75-87. If the dating is correct the kerbstones of the great tumulus at Meath, Ireland would give an early example of such spiraliiform motifs, Ibid. pp. 116-7, Ill. 110.
  6. SANDARS (1968) p. 47, Pl. 42.  
A discussion on the possible origins for the spiral is given pp. 123-4.
  7. SANDARS (1968) pp. 177-8, Pls. 172-4. However note the problems in dating these to EB or 2nd millennium.

Whatever the origin, the Aegean of the Early and Middle Bronze Ages shows extensive use of elaborate spiral compositions. Examples 281 to 284 show the four basic types while the Lerna examples are discussed under 285.

- 281. Large Jar from Knossos - MMII.  
Running Spiral.
- 282. Mace Head from Mallia - MMIII.  
Quadruple Spiral Pattern.<sup>8</sup>
- 283. Three Sided Prism from Elounda - MMII B-III A.  
S Spirals.
- 284. Stamp Seal from Hagia Triada - EMII-MMII.  
C Spirals.  
When a pattern is formed by linking many of these it is the interlocked C Spiral as in 307.
- 285. Impressed Design from Lerna - EH.  
Two Rows of Running Spirals.  
The early mainland example is clearly if not evenly rendered. MH pottery continues the Spiral motif.<sup>9</sup>  
EH sealings from Lerna show many interlocking designs including the S, C, and Quadruple Spiral.<sup>10</sup>

In the East Egyptian art knows the Spiral from Gerzean times but elaborate spiraliform motifs appear first on scarab designs of the Middle Kingdom. Ward would now date their earliest appearance to Dynasty XI where examples of the S, C, Quadruple, and Running Spiral are attested.<sup>11</sup> This is also the date suggested for the Montet Jar found at Byblos which contains many scarabs with S, C, and Running Spirals.<sup>12</sup> Scarabs from Schechem and Lachish give additional

- 
- 8. KANTOR (1947a) p. 47 mentions the piece. See also the Quadruple Spirals of the ECII Period from Syros, HIGGINS pp. 54-5, and the LMII examples from Knossos in gold, HOOD (1952) Pl. 54(a). Pl. 54(d) shows a Running Spiral in ivory.
  - 9. BUCH (1966) Pl. 44, Motifs 108 to 113, 118A, 118B, 120.
  - 10. HEATH (1958) Nos. S45, S46, S47, S49, and WIENCKE (1969a) Nos. S72, S74, S75.
  - 11. WARD (1971) pp. 109-13 summarizes the evidence, pp. 115, 118-9 and Figs. 25, 1-7, 26.5.
  - 12. TUFNELL and WARD (1966) p. 227 suggest the date 2130-2040, the beginning of Dynasty X to the reunification of Egypt under Mentuhotep II.  
WARD (1971) p. 63 now suggests narrowing the date to the second half of the 21st Century. The C, S, and Running Spirals are illustrated TUFNELL and WARD (1966) Fig. 2 Nos. 9-22, 61 and Fig. 3 Nos. 62, 65, 66, 70-5.  
The Concentric circle patterns have not been included here with the true spiral motifs. Many are Linked Circles.

examples of similar spiraliiform designs.<sup>13</sup> In Egypt in Dynasty XII, ceiling patterns use the C Spiral as in 235.<sup>14</sup>

In the Mesopotamian, Syrian and Anatolian areas in the third millennium there are sporadic examples of C and S Spirals<sup>15</sup> and in the second millennium there are some examples of the Running Spiral.

- 289. Throne Podium, Mari - 18th C.  
Running Spiral Border.<sup>16</sup>  
A true Running Spiral.
- 290. Vase Fragment from Byblos - 18th C.  
Two Rows of Running Spiral.<sup>17</sup>  
Though the two rows are linked the pattern does not constitute the true quadruple pattern since the centres of the Spirals are not staggered as in 282 and 286.
- 291. Sealing from Hattusas - Old-Mid Hittite.  
The running Spiral is a border round half the seal and a Guilloche the other half. Another Guilloche and Spirals are in the centre.  
Another Hittite seal of the same period 264 has a similar design.
- 292A. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Spirals and other designs.
- 292B. Sealing from Hattusas - Old-Mid Hittite.  
Spirals(?).  
This Hittite seal of the same date as 291 and 264 shows an attempt at a Spiral border which has not been successful.

13. HORN (1966) for Schechem and TUFNELL (1958) for Lachish.

14. For the contemporary Egyptian spiraliiform designs see SMITH AA pp. 115-17, and the recent article on the Tomb of Hepzefa SHAW (1970).

The faience figure in the Brooklyn Museum, RIEFSTAHL (1972) comes from a tomb of apparently Middle Kingdom date but the nature of the glaze and elements of the style incline scholars to date it to the end of the Middle Kingdom or even the Hyksos period. It is a pity that the date cannot be fixed more accurately since the figure wears a kilt with an S Spiral decoration and may be the earliest Cretan depicted in Egypt.

15. WARD (1971) pp. 108-9 summarizes the evidence.

16. This example is discussed KANTOR (1947a) p. 31, along with the other running Spiral border at Mari, the Investiture Wall painting.

17. Ibid., p. 31. Kantor notes that this is the earliest example showing a disk in the Spiral centres and that early Aegean examples do not use the disk. It may not be the Minoan Import as some have claimed.

In the Late Bronze Age in the Aegean the spiral remains one of the most-used motifs. Mycenaean art uses it extensively though in the LHIIIB period there seems to be a reduction in interest in the overall rapport designs.

286. Dagger Blade from Mycenae - LHI.  
 Quadruple Spiral Pattern on a Dagger.  
 The pattern is cleverly fitted into the long triangular shape by gradually reducing the size of the Spirals.  
 The centres of the Spirals are studded with Rosettes, and then when the Spirals are too small, with dots.  
 Both Rosettes and dots so used remain a regular addition to the motif.
287. Sword Hilt from Mycenae - LHI.  
 S Spirals.  
 The use of C Spirals and Running Spirals is seen on the Shaft Graves Stele 423.
288. Repoussé Disk from Mycenae - LHI.  
 Octopus with Spiraliform Tentacles.  
 This design betrays very early the Mainland tendency to render organic forms as neat patterns. The spiralling in the floral design 200 and the use of the Spiral to render curls on hybrid creatures like the Sphinx 103 and Griffin 115 are part of the same tendency.
295. Section of Ceiling, Orchomenos - LHIII.  
 Quadruple Spiral Pattern.<sup>18</sup>  
 The relief is one of the finest examples of this form. The detail includes Papyrus motifs in the interstices and dot centres to the Spirals. This is similar to the use of the Papyrus and the Rosette centres on the double running Spiral border in 199.
296. Doorway Relief from Mycenae - LHIII.  
 Three Rows of Running Spiral.  
 This use of the motif on the Treasury of Atreus should be compared with the use on the Triglyph and Half Rosette motif 229.
297. Relief Band from Tiryns - LHIII.  
 Running Spiral.  
 This example has the dotted centre.
298. Throne Room Hearth, Pylos<sup>19</sup> - LHIIIB.  
 Running Spiral Border.

- 
18. KANTOR (1947a) Pl. II H and p. 26.  
 Others to compare with 199 are the ivory from Mycenae, WACE (1954) Pl. 38(a), and the tomb door design at Argos, VERM Fig. 45.
  19. The Running Spiral was also used as a surround to the great hearth at Mycenae, PLOMMER (1965) p. 210.



- 299. Fresco from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Running Spiral Border.  
Here Rosettes stud the Spiral centres as in 413.
- 300. Carved Fragment from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Part of a Spiral Design in Ivory.
- 301. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Running Spiral Designs.  
Furumark's Motive 46 Running Spiral. Some of  
Furumark's designs under this heading have been  
discussed under the Guilloche motif, 273.
- 302. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Other Spiral Designs.  
Furumark's Motives 49, 50, 51. These, together  
with the one above show the gradual disintegration  
of the spiraliform designs.

In the Late Bronze Age in the East, involved spiraliform patterns continue to be used though they appear less popular at the end of the period.

- 293. Ceiling Design from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Continuous S Spirals and a Running Spiral Border.  
Egyptian developments of the early New Kingdom give  
Palmette centres to the "spirals" in the all-over  
pattern and dot centres to the Running Spiral.  
Separate Spirals are seen on the earlier jewellery  
example 312.
- 294. Wall Relief, Deir el Bahari - Dyn. XVIII.  
Running Spiral Pattern on a Barge Canopy.
- 303. Ceiling Design, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Spiraliform Pattern with other designs.  
This pattern is based on either the interlocked  
C Spiral or the Running Spiral or the Linked Circles  
with links running counter. The Spiral centres are  
dots and the interstices are filled with very stylized  
Rosettes, more natural looking lotus flowers and  
Egyptian hieroglyphs. What an amalgam!<sup>20</sup>  
The true quadruple Spiral pattern with Rosettes and  
Bucrania is seen in 218.
- 304. Gold Earrings from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Running Spiral and other designs.  
Each of Tutankhamun's earrings shows a true running  
Spiral on the bar holding the pendant beads.  
The possibility of these Spirals simply being the  
result of metal working techniques must be borne  
in mind.<sup>21</sup>

---

20. Another pattern from the same tomb shows involved spiraliform designs, DAVIES (1936) Pl. LXXXIV. See also the Tomb of Huy ceiling, DAVIES (1926) Pl. IV.  
The rhyton from Abydos 519 shows a Running Spiral.  
For a discussion of this piece and parallels at Kition see below pp. 111, 218, 229.

21. KANTOR (1947a) p. 30 discusses this problem for earlier examples.  
See also below p. 229.

- 305A. Gold Jewellery from Alalakh - 1273-1194.  
Running Spiral.  
The motif is imperfectly rendered.
- 305B. Engraved Handle from Alalakh - 1370-1273.  
Curvilinear Design.<sup>22</sup>  
A small ivory object from Alalakh with designs similar to those on finds from the Shaft Graves at Mycenae.
306. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - Late Bronze Age.  
Two Rows of Running Spiral.  
The Spirals are "appliqued" in gold on a lapis lazuli core. This Cypriot example should be compared with 304 and 305A above.
307. Belt Fragment from Bogazkoy - Hittite Empire.  
Interlocked C Spiral Pattern.  
The motif is perfectly rendered. However the border is not a Running Spiral but a Guilloche.
308. Relief Earring from Alaca Huyuk - Hittite Empire.  
Spiral Designs on a Bird.  
This example shows an imperfectly understood S Spiral.<sup>23</sup> It is worked as if for an interlocking design but the top spiral "twines" the wrong way.

The Spiral motif is known in both Egypt and Asia in isolated examples in the third millennium. However at this time the Aegean already has a developed tradition of elaborate interlocking spiraliform designs in Cycladic and Mainland art. In MM Crete the Spiral motif develops an extensive repertoire of designs around four basic types and these spread to Mainland Greece, reinforcing the indigenous Helladic and Cycladic tradition. The four variations of the motif also appear in Middle Kingdom Egypt where designs incorporating them become quite popular. However, Asia, by contrast, knows in the early 2nd millennium only the Running Spiral and this only in a few, though not insignificant, examples.

The Late Bronze Age opens with the Spiral still widely used in all its forms in Late Palatial Crete and in the Shaft Graves art

---

22. Ibid. Pl. XXVI C and p. 101.

23. Compare the breast curls on Mycenaean Griffins of a comparable date, 26, 27, 30, 55, 123, 124, 125.

of the Mainland. Early New Kingdom Egypt too, continues to use a variety of spiraliiform patterns. In the 14th and 13th centuries Mycenaean art views the Spiral as one of its most popular motifs but restricts itself almost exclusively to the Quadruple Spiral and the Running Spiral, with the latter taking over completely by the end of IIIB. Further east the Running Spiral is the most favoured form, but sporadic examples of other types occur in Syria and the Hittite lands, and Egyptian art still reveals a lingering adherence to all-over patterns of spiraliiform design for ceilings. However in all eastern areas the use of the motif appears to fade towards the end of the period.

In conclusion one must comment on the increasingly static nature of the Spiral motif. The bursting torsional force that was so apparent in the early Spiral designs now seems to have abated leaving only a suggestion of its original dynamism quite under control in neat Running Spiral bands.

## 2 MOTIFS COMMON TO THE AEGEAN AND THE EAST

### Flying Gallop

The Flying Gallop is the convention whereby an attempt is made to express the power and speed of an animal by giving a profile view of its body at full stretch, its legs out-flung and clear of the ground. Though it might appear to us to be the obvious way of depicting animals moving fast, it did not appear so to the artists of the ancient world.<sup>1</sup> In the early formative stages of both the Mesopotamian and Egyptian artistic traditions the artists chose static animal poses and these static poses remained the standard for these arts and the derivative traditions until well into the second millennium. Minoan art however did have this eidetic view of the animal kingdom's propensity for swift movement.<sup>2</sup>

The motif is first attested in the Aegean in MM seals. Minoan art develops two variations of the pose, the Flying Leap where the animal is springing down, its body at an angle of 45° to the ground, and the Reverse Twist, where in either of the above two poses the animal's head and forepart is turned back, twisting the backbone.<sup>3</sup>

- 
1. Mesolithic man, however, depicted the swift movement of animals in this pose. A fine example is the charging goat in the 4th cavity at Remigia, Castellon, Spain, SANDARS (1968) Plate 86 and pp. 89-90. Earlier Paleolithic depictions of the "flying gallop" may represent the animal dead and stretched for skinning, Ibid. p. 56.
  2. There is at present no means of ascertaining whether there is any continuity between the pre-historic and the Minoan examples of the flying gallop. It is interesting to note, however, that both designs which appear to develop in the Aegean area, involved Spirals and the Flying Gallop, have earlier examples from European pre-history.
  3. The twist at the backbone is a characteristic feature of the representation of animal poses in Minoan art. BOARDMAN (1970) pp. 24-5 suggests for the circular seal designs the twist is the result of trying to depict the accurate observation of a reclining animal, seen from above. It may well be that the Reverse Twist of the Flying Gallop repertoire also springs from acute observation; the sight of a dog running parallel to its quarry and twisting in to bite the legs.

It is essential to grasp how different the poses of the Flying Gallop repertoire are from any of the static poses of the Mesopotamian and Egyptian traditions especially the Egyptian poses where the animals are so firmly attached to the ground line. Evans discusses the motif and gives parallels<sup>4</sup> but this survey will rely more on Helene Kantor's work on the Aegean Animal Style and its influence upon eastern traditions.<sup>5</sup> Examples 309 to 314 show the early forms of the motif in the Aegean and the East.

- 309. Dagger Blade from Lasithi - MMII.  
Board in the Flying Gallop and Hunter.  
This is Evans' earliest example.<sup>6</sup> Other examples include the Bull Relief at Knossos 443, the coursing stags from Thera 450, and the Shaft Graves Griffin and lion 116, 384.<sup>7</sup>
- 310. Flattened Cylinder from Crete - MMIB.  
Agrimi in the Flying Leap attacked by a Dog in the Flying Leap with Reverse Twist.  
This is a classic example with each of the standard variations to the Flying Gallop motif perfectly rendered. The Reverse Twist is Kantor's "shift in the axis".<sup>8</sup>
- 311. Seal Impression from Phaestos - MMIB - MMIIA.  
Animal in the Flying Gallop, regardant.  
This is the earliest example. It does not show a Reverse Twist since the alignment of the backbone still accords with the direction of the movement of the animal. Only the head is swivelled 180°, an effect for which the heraldic term regardant suffices. The Reverse Twist requires the head and neck, and even at times the forefeet, to be twisted back at an angle to the line of "flight".

- 
- 4. PMI pp. 713-21 with acknowledgements to Monsieur Salomon Reinach for first recognizing the "gallop volant".
  - 5. KANTOR (1947a) particularly pp. 62-78 and pp. 92-7.
  - 6. PMI p. 719. His arguments for being able to date this to MMII are not sound. He uses this and the bead seal, illustrated as 310, both unprovenanced archaeologically, to give a sure dating of MMII for the beginning of the Flying Gallop motif. Luckily the discovery of the sealing 311 at Phaestos gives us an archaeologically attested date of MMIB-MMIIa for our Minoan prototype. See CMS II.5 p. IX.  
Other Phaestos sealings showing the motif are CMS II.5 259, 263, 277.
  - 7. Comparisons between Minoan examples and designs from the Shaft Graves are given in VERMEULE (1975) 50, 51, 53-56, 58, 59 and pp. 38-43.
  - 8. KANTOR (1947a) p. 67, in her full discussion of the Puimre scene.

312. Falcon Collar from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Animals in the Flying Gallop and other designs.  
Beads from the collar of Ah-hotpe show lions, ibex, and gazelles in the Flying Gallop regardant. Somewhat later the Flying Gallop motif becomes even more fully accepted into Egyptian art as evidenced by the spirited hunting scenes in early Dynasty XVIII tomb paintings.  
The best example is the scene from the tomb of Puimre 420 where the full repertoire of the motif is seen - Flying Gallop, Flying Leap and Reverse Twist.
313. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Animals in the Flying Gallop and Flying Leap.  
Lion, bull and ibex are shown in the most spirited poses on this Old Syrian seal.<sup>9</sup>  
The bull on the Cypriot seal 78 is also in a Flying Leap.
314. Dagger Hilt from Saqqara - Syrian, Late M.B.<sup>10</sup>  
Gazelle in the Flying Leap and other designs.<sup>11</sup>

In the 14th and 13th centuries the Flying Gallop motif continues in use in Mycenaean art.

315. Cup Fragments from Dendra - LHIIIA.  
Animals in the Flying Gallop and Flying Leap.  
This tangled hunting scene is close in detail to the Puimre example 420. There may even be a Reverse Twist in the dog at the base but the piece is too damaged to be sure.  
The attack scenes 482 and 483 make spirited use of the Flying Gallop and Flying Leap.
316. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Stag and Dog in the Flying Gallop.  
This example takes the use of the motif down to the end of the period. Other examples include 385, 444 and, in part, 381.
317. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Bull in the Flying Gallop regardant.  
This bull-leaping scene echoes earlier Minoan subjects as do examples 274B, 364, 366, and its treatment suggests that the original seal may have been a Minoan piece of an earlier date.

- 
9. Dating the Syrian seal illustrated as 313 is still something of a problem. Though he places it in the Old Syrian style Buchanan is prepared to bring it right down to the final phase of this, even to the late 16th century, BUCH p. 175. Kantor illustrates the seal and a companion piece (BUCH 897) in KANTOR (1947a) Pl. XXIII IA, B and discusses the dating problem on pp. 95-7. She is prepared to bring it down into the 14th century.
10. For a discussion of the dagger, its design and the problem of dating it, see FRANK AA pp. 138-9.
11. A design at Kerma in the governorship of Hepzefa (reign of Sesostri I) also shows a Flying Gallop. SMITH AA pp. 116-20, Pl. 82B.

318. Wall Painting from Tiryns - LHIII.  
Boar and Dogs in the Flying Gallop, Dog in the Flying Leap.  
The famous Hunting Fresco shows the motif at its spirited best.
319. Wall Painting from Tiryns - LHIII.  
Bull in the Flying Gallop with Leaper.  
This fresco design can be compared with the small scale example 317 above.
320. Relief Plaque from Spata - LHIII.  
Lion in the Flying Leap attacking a Bull.  
A favourite Mycenaean theme, the attack, is rendered by this motif. The turned head of the lion is reminiscent of the Reverse Twist pose but cannot be called that since it lacks the dynamic contortion of the earlier poses. Indeed this lion is the regular Mycenaean lion who turns gardant to crunch through the spine of his prey. The poses in the earlier Shaft Graves example 176 and the ones from this same period but fitted to a circular design 359 interesting variations.

As the Late Bronze Age advances, the East continues to use the motif but in Egypt the most splendid examples are already past.

321. Reliefs from Amarna - Dyn. XVIII.  
Animal scenes from Amarna.  
Some of the earlier influence remains to produce these animals in the Flying Gallop and Flying Leap. For the others, it is feet firmly on the ground line again as in the true Egyptian tradition.
322. Cosmetic Box Lid - Dyn. XVIII-XIX.  
Animal Attack.  
Only a suggestion of the motif remains. This is true also of the Syrian seal 179 and the Egyptian painting of the Syrian box 118.
323. Wall Painting, Deir el Medineh - Dyn. XIX.  
Animals.  
The animals are not yet tied back to the ground line though they look quite static. Only the little calf, its head turned back, seems to show the spirit of the early 18th Dynasty examples and the Aegean prototypes.
324. Orthostat Relief from Alaca Huyuk - Hittite Empire.  
Bull with Lowered Horn Attacking.  
This example suggests the influence of the Flying Gallop motif.
325. Cylinder Seal from Maroni - LCI-II.  
Leaping Griffin, Ibex in the Flying Gallop regardant, and other designs.  
This seal would appear to have a clumsily worked attack scene with the Griffin leaping over an ibex which is in the usual Aegean pose for the fleeing animal.<sup>12</sup>

---

12. Kenna's description, CCA3 p. 21, "an ibex recumbent but regardant, a winged gryphon rampant" does not seem to me to indicate the true nature of the design at all.

326. Rhyton from Kition - 13th C.<sup>13</sup>  
 Animals in the Flying Gallop.  
 This is the standard motif, even to the regarant head on some animals. Other Cypriot examples include the Sphinx in 158, one stag contorted in 427, and the hunting scene in 367.<sup>14</sup>

In the Aegean the Flying Gallop motif originates in MM art and continues in LM art at which time it is avidly taken by the Mycenaean craftsmen of LHI and II. In Egypt, the motif appears on small scale pieces from early Dynasty XVIII and then is employed in the tomb paintings of the 15th century. Something of this usage lingers on in Egyptian animal depictions of the 14th century but is quite gone by the end of the 13th century.<sup>15</sup> Syria knows the motif perhaps as early as the 16th century but produces finer examples in the 14th and 13th centuries when Cyprus too joins the list of users of the motif. The Mycenaean tradition uses the motif to the end of IIIB, perhaps showing a predilection for the simple Flying Gallop form rather than any of the variation poses. It uses the motif in ivory, fresco, and seal designs, but one should note that perhaps the power of the motif is waning towards the end. Though the Pylos examples include several sealings there are only two very damaged pieces of fresco which may show the Flying Gallop.<sup>16</sup>

- 
13. KARAGEORGHIS (1976b) Pl. III, pp. 32 and 64.  
 See also below Chapter 7.
14. KANTOR (1947a) illustrates this piece Pl. XXVIA and discusses the workmanship p. 93.
15. Ibid., p. 70-1.
16. A piece from Room 43 shows the forelegs of a galloping stag, PNII 19H43, p. 69 and Pl. 121. An earlier piece from a pit below the floor of the Wine Magazine shows a bull leaper and perhaps a galloping bull. PNII 36H 105, p. 77 and Pl. C. The seals which made the sealings with Flying Gallop designs may be much earlier than LHIIIB, above pp. 7, 109.



The final point of discussion on the iconography must be the small number of examples not only in Crete but the other areas as well. In Mycenaean art, if the Shaft Graves group is taken away, all that is left are four or five frescoes, about twenty seals or sealings, and as many ivories. There are no Flying Gallops in Mycenaean pottery.<sup>17</sup> The true eastern examples do not number more than the Aegean total. One should immediately compare the usage of the Heraldic Poses, or the Antithetical Group, or the Griffin or Rosette. Stevenson Smith has summed up this problem about the Flying Gallop very well. "So vivid is the impact of this ... form of expression that we are surprised to find that it has been produced by so few preserved examples".<sup>18</sup>

---

17. Furumark says he is "struck by the absence of the characteristic flying gallop" in his discussion of his Motive 3. Bull, FURU p. 244.

18. SMITH IN p. 26.

### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Smiting Figure, Pharaoh and Weather God

The Smiting Figure is the motif whereby the natural pose of the attacking man has been codified into an eloquent statement of the overpowering might of god or king. The figure usually strides to the right, his left arm down holding prisoner or bundle of weapons, his right arm held high behind him with weapon upraised and poised ready to descend. This stance is used in the East to portray a conquering king, especially Pharaoh, and also a powerful god, the Syrian and Anatolian Weather God. Examples 327 to 330 show the Smiting Figure as conquering king.

- 327. Palette from Hierakonpolis - Dyn. I.  
Pharaoh striking down a Prisoner.  
The Narmer Palette gives one of the earliest and clearest statements of the motif.<sup>1</sup>  
The Dynasty XII example 15 closely follows the earlier form. This symbolic pose is not to be confused with the naturalistic rendering of tomb-owners hunting or harpooning as in 421.
- 328. Cylinder Seal - Transition to ED.  
Hero executing a Vanquished Foe and other designs.  
In essence, this scene on an early Mesopotamian seal is the same as that on the Narmer Palette. It is Amiet's "Victory Theme" but the characteristic Smiting Figure does not appear this early in Mesopotamian art. Ningirsu, on the Stele of Eannatum, simply clasps the vanquished in a net, his mace held at the ready.<sup>2</sup>
- 329. Cylinder Seal from Susa - Larsa Period.  
King striking down an Enemy and other designs.  
This seal shows the full Smiting Figure used for the king.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. The earliest example is an ivory plaque of Dynasty I showing King Den smiting an Asiatic, DROWER (1971) p. 352.

2. SMITH AA 35.

3. A fragment of a mural at Mari shows a hand grasping the top-knots of two heads, indicating a similar pose, PARROT (1958) Fig. 36.

330. Relief from Karnak - Dyn. XVIII.  
Tuthmosis III smiting the Asiatics.  
This example shows the New Kingdom elaboration of the earlier simple form. Now there is not just one prisoner but a whole bundle of supplicating vanquished foreigners.

The other figure which regularly takes up this pose is the Weather God, whose iconography has been developing since Akkadian times. There he is depicted in a long robe either standing on a winged dragon 335 or riding in a chariot pulled by that beast. In Babylonian times after the Amorite incursions the Weather God changes his garb to a short skirt and takes a stance with arm up-raised behind him. This is almost without exception his dress and pose in Syria, and nearly always in Anatolia. In Syria also he appears more war-like, wearing a pointed helmet with protruding horns and brandishing weapons rather than the expected lightning flash or thunderbolt.<sup>4</sup> Examples 331A to 334B show the development in iconography of the Weather God down to the characteristic pose for the Syrian and Hittite Weather Gods in the Late Bronze Age.

- 331A. Cylinder Seal - Imp. Akk. III.  
Akkadian Weather God.  
The god rides in his chariot drawn by winged dragons. This is the first type of full depiction after the separate use of the lion-headed eagle and the winged lions.<sup>5</sup>  
The next stage is to depict the god without chariot, simply mounted on the dragon as in 335.
- 331B. Cylinder Seal - Early-Mid Syrian.  
Syrian Weather God and other designs.  
In this seal the standard Syrian iconography is clear; the warrior-like aspect, the accompanying bull, the loin cloth, the striding pose with arm raised.
332. Statuette from Tokat - Old Hittite.  
Hittite Weather God.  
This small bronze accords with Hittite iconography on later reliefs.

---

4. For a discussion of the iconography of the Weather God see VANEL (1965). Note also his comments on the possible origin of much of this iconographical detail in the Middle Euphrates area c2000, p. 165, and his discussion on the iconographical links with Egypt in New Kingdom times, pp. 103-7.  
SMITH (1962) also discusses this iconography though his main thrust is to investigate prototypes for the Classical Zeus.

5. VANEL (1965) pp. 11-17.

333. Stele from Ugarit - 1450-1360.  
 Syrian Weather God, Baal.<sup>6</sup>  
 Among the usual iconographical details the war-like aspect and the mountains over which he strides are featured.
- 334A. Sealing from Hattusas - Hittite Empire.  
 Hittite Weather God.  
 The mountain and the god have co-alesced.  
 The weather god at Yazilikaya strides across mountain gods, 433.
- 334B. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - Late Bronze Age.  
 Weather God and other designs.  
 This very fine seal shows the god in warrior form.  
 It shares many iconographical details with 331B, 332 and 333 above.

The purpose of this brief survey of the Smiting Figure motif is to point out its long established widespread use in both great eastern traditions, in one to depict the great king, in the other to portray a mighty god. However no grand personage or god of the Aegean world is ever rendered in such a manner.

---

6. Ibid. Figure 38 and pp. 82-4. He wishes to date the piece much earlier than is usually proposed.

### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Star Disk in Crescent

The motif, the Star Disk in Crescent, is the most complicated of a series of celestial symbols that are among the most pervasive small scale motifs in the Mesopotamian tradition. Apart from the simple symbols of Crescent, Star, and Cross (four pointed star), there are various combinations of these defined in Edith Porada's terminology as,<sup>1</sup>

Sun Disk : a plain disk

Star Disk: a star encircled by a disk

Star Disk in Crescent: a crescent drawn below the star disk so that the latter seems to rest on the crescent

Cross Disk: a cross encircled by a disk

Crescent Disk: a crescent the horns of which are joined by a thin line to form a complete circle.

Briggs Buchanan uses these terms but finds the following also necessary.<sup>2</sup>

Cross in Crescent: where the cross is not encircled

Disk in Crescent: where the disk is small and sits the curve of the crescent.

To these terms one more must be added.

Star in Crescent: where the star is not encircled.

Examples 335 to 338 show the established usage in the Mesopotamian and its derivative traditions.

335. Cylinder Seal - Akkadian.

Cross in Crescent, Star and other designs.

Other Akkadian seals show the Star 6, and the Crescent 331A.

Many Stars are seen in the Old Syrian seal 94A and the Hittite signet 37.

It should be noted that the many-rayed Star and the four-rayed Cross both show the rays finishing in sharp points.

---

1. PORADA (1948a) Glossary p. XXV. The capitals are mine.

2. BUCH pp. 63, 173, 196. I have omitted his hyphens to match Porada's listing.

336. Stele from Ur - Ur III.  
Star in Crescent.  
This symbol is set atop the Stele of Ur-Nammu.  
There are two Stars atop the earlier Stele of Naram-Sin.<sup>3</sup>
337. Cylinder Seal - Old Babylonian.  
Star Disk in Crescent and other designs.  
A parallel use of the motif is seen in 329.
338. Cylinder Seal - Old Syrian.  
Star Disk in Crescent and other designs.  
Other Old Syrian seals show the Disk in Crescent 48B, 174A, B.  
In a late 2nd millennium seal from the Levant 99B the motif is again used.

Examples 339 and 340 from outside the Mesopotamian, Syrian and Anatolian areas show Star Disk and Crescent used in a similar way.

339. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII.  
Star Disk and Crescent above Wavy Lines and other designs.  
This elaborate signet design seemingly misunderstands the motifs and places the Crescent on its edge and thus needs an extra "crescent" to subtend them both. It no doubt borrows the wavy lines from fresco divisions,<sup>4</sup> a thing clearer in the other elaborate gold signet 143, which shows a Star Disk and an upside-down Crescent. Both signets rely heavily on Minoan iconography.<sup>5</sup>  
A vestige of these usages could be left in the LHII-III signet 163.
340. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - LCIA-IIC.  
Disk in Crescent, Star and other designs.  
This seal indicates a regular usage in the island.  
Comparisons are 70A, 85A,<sup>6</sup> 86A and the Crescent in 158.

Examples 341 and 342 are illustrated to warn of the confusion that can arise with these motifs if they are found in isolation and not as part of a scene where their position indicates their character.

---

3. PARR 213.

4. See below pp. 129-30. For a discussion of the whole design see THOMAS (1938-9) pp. 79-82.

5. This heavy reliance may indicate that both signets are Minoan in origin. Example 143 has however been designated Mycenaean in style, above p. 61, but 339 has much in its treatment to indicate Minoan style.

6. Drilled like a Rosette but in the position of the Star.

341. Ivory Roundel from Alalakh - 1447-1370.  
 Called a "star and thunderbolt(?) design"<sup>7</sup>  
 it looks like an amalgamation of a Cross Disk  
 and the Egyptian floret in 342 below.<sup>8</sup>  
 Other examples are quoted by Wainwright who calls  
 the design the "Cappadocian symbol".<sup>9</sup>  
 Further confusion arises when the other Cross-in-  
 circle design is equated with the Cross Disk.  
 With the Cross-in-circle the cross terminates in  
 flat ends fitted against the circumference of the  
 circle and thus gives a "four-spoked wheel design".  
 It is an ancient motif known from the 4th millennium  
 in Europe and occurring in Aegean Bronze Age art and  
 in Hattian and Mitannian designs.<sup>10</sup>
342. Furniture Roundel - Dyn. IV.  
 Egyptian Composite Floral Pattern.  
 Not to be confused with the Rosette, this composite  
 pattern betrays its floral elements in all Egyptian  
 renderings but when carelessly copied elsewhere it  
 can look very like a star.  
 The stellate gold jewellery in the Shaft Graves looks  
 like a copy of the Egyptian floret.<sup>11</sup>

The celestial symbols of the Mesopotamian tradition rendered  
 by the Star Disk in Crescent group of motifs should not be confused  
 with other designs like the Egyptian floret or the Cross in Circle.  
 Both in their precise iconographical details of pointed rays and  
 particular combinations and in their usage to "preside" over some  
 ritual or mythological scenes they are set apart from other motifs.  
 Isolated Aegean examples reveal both these iconographical features.

- 
7. ALAL p. 290.
8. Or even more like the simpler flower pattern inlay first found  
 in Old Kingdom designs SMITH OK Figs. 56, 57.  
 Compare the weapons (thunderbolts?) held by the Weather God in 331B.
9. WAINWRIGHT (1956) p. 137. He goes on to argue, pp. 138-42, that  
 this motif is derived from the Egyptian floral and scroll patterns  
 by way of scarab designs adopted in Syria.
10. SANDARS (1968) pp. 174, 180 for European examples. Aegean examples  
 of the Cross in Circle include Kamares pottery designs, WALBERG  
 (1976) Radiating Motifs Fig. 40 i 1, 4, ii 4, MH pottery BUCH (1966)  
 Motifs 100, 101 and the ornaments from the Shaft Graves KARO XX 38.  
 AKUR Pls. 8, 9 show a ritual standard of the Hattians.  
 FRANK CS pp. 275-9 discusses the confusion over the Mitannian Pillar  
 of Heaven motif which is seen supporting a Winged Sun Disk or the  
 Cross in Circle Pl. XLII e.
11. KARO Pls. XIV, XVI, XIX.

### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Winged Sun Disk

In this Egyptian motif the plain disk of the sun is borne along by the outstretched wings of the Horus Falcon. Well established in the Old Kingdom, the motif continues unchanged through all periods of Egyptian art as a most striking symbol combining the power of the Sun, Horus, and Pharaoh. It is adopted by various peoples to the north where it gains accretions from other sources.

343. Winged Sun Disk Designs - Dyn. IV-VI.

The XIIth Dynasty provides example 391.

The motif in the confused Syrian example 16 has legs (like Imdugud?) included too. It is clearer in the seal 174A.

344. Seal Impressions - Hittite Empire.

Seals of the Hittite Kings.<sup>2</sup>

These compositions show the motif used as a symbol of royalty. Placed above the King's name it is used in one of the traditional Egyptian ways. However some iconographical details are different from the Egyptian forms. The wings now cradle the disk which may not be the plain disk of the sun but may be the Star, Star Disk, or Cross Disk of the Mesopotamian celestial symbol group. Furthermore this particular rendering of the wings may reflect the influence of the Mitannians who used spread wings atop a pole to represent the sky supported by a pillar as in 64B and 212, their Pillar of Heaven motif.<sup>3</sup> Other Hittite examples of the Empire Period include the blend with the Sacred Tree in the bronze 155, the plaque 219, and the seal 334A.

The Egyptian Winged Sun Disk, together with its derivations in other eastern traditions, must be accounted one of the great motifs of the Late Bronze Age by virtue of its widespread use and its power as a symbol of the two mightiest monarchies of the period. It does not, however, become a motif of either Minoan or Mycenaean art.

- 
1. SMITH OK p. 326. The earliest example is on the curtain box of Hetepheres. The uraei were added in the reign of Ne-user-ra.
  2. Akurgal discusses these designs more fully, AKUR pp. 62-74.
  3. Frankfort discusses this most important Mitannian motif FRANK CS pp. 275-8, and he lists the four features which help shape the Mitannian and Syrian designs. If the two central designs in 344 are not the Cross Disk then they may be the Cross in Circle which motif would relate the designs more closely to the Pillar of Heaven motif.



### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Scale Mountain

This motif is created early in the Mesopotamian tradition to depict hilly or mountainous places and thus signify the abode of the gods. With this motif it is not the iconographical detail which defines it so much as its usage. The Scale Mountain is always used to subtend a ritual or mythological scene or a religious symbol.

It is not to be confused with the decorative or feather Scale Pattern.<sup>1</sup>

345. Cylinder Seal - Akkadian.

"The Liberation of the Sun God".<sup>2</sup>

In this seal the Scale Mountain performs its regular role as the proper setting for the deeds of the gods.

346. Cylinder Seal - Akkadian.

Scene of the Gods.

This shows a scene similar to 345 where Shamash emerges from the Scale Mountain.

Another usage of the motif is as a base for the Sacred Tree seen in 4, 149, and 151.

347. Wall Painting, Mari - 18th C.

Scene of the Gods.

The Gods are enthroned on a Scale Mountain as in 11 also.

348. Figurine from Bogazkoy - Hittite Empire.

The god is half Scale Mountain. This is also the case in examples 334A and 433.

349. Seal Impression from Knossos - LMI-II.<sup>3</sup>

Mistress of Animals on the Scale Mountain.

The Scale Mountain is used in the proper Mesopotamian manner as the abode of the gods.

350. Seal Impression from Knossos - LMI-II.

Animals about a Scale Mountain.

This much damaged Minoan design suggests the motif was used as the base for the central symbol for the Antithetical Group as perhaps in 4, 149, and 151.

This motif has a long and persistent tradition in Mesopotamian art and its derivatives, enjoying new life in the 14th and 13th centuries in Hittite Imperial art. The Scale Mountain is found in isolated examples in Minoan art but is not found in Mycenaean art.

---

1. See above Chapter 2.

2. Parrot's title for the scene. PARR p. 384.

3. RUTKOWSKI (1972) pp. 173-5.

### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Duel

It is characteristic of Mycenaean art and particularly revealing of the Mycenaean spirit that, when it comes to rendering war scenes, it is done in terms of one to one combat. This is here termed the Duel motif. The type is set early in Shaft Graves art but continues right through to the end of Mycenaean times. Examples 351 to 354, 356 and 359 show the early designs with the first three of these from the Shaft Graves.

351. Rectangular Seal from Mycenae - LHI.  
Duel between two Warriors.  
Here the stress is not only on the man to man combat but on that precise point in the Duel when the mortal blow is about to be delivered.
352. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHI.  
Battle Scene, Four Warriors.  
One battle has been discontinued, the two warriors lying wounded, flanking the two who are still fighting. This second Duel is again rendered at the point of delivery of the fatal thrust as in 351.
353. Rectangular Seal from Mycenae - LHI.  
Duel between a Warrior and a Lion.  
The Duel should be between two men but the Mycenaean artist has so raised this lion to the stature of an heroic adversary that he has virtually presented us with another Duel. Even after the fatal thrust here shown, the warrior will suffer grievous wounds.<sup>1</sup>
354. Lentoid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
Duel between a Warrior and a Boar.  
The theme of 353 is repeated, this time with a massive boar which may be the local counterpart of the lion.<sup>2</sup>
356. Lentoid Seal from Crete - LMII.  
Duel between two Warriors.  
The motif and its treatment suggest Mycenaean work. The Duel is not a Minoan theme. The closest to it is perhaps the boxing match as in the Theran fresco<sup>3</sup> or the steatite rhyton from Hagia Triada.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly the dagger with the boar hunt MMII, 309, would seem iconographically more convincing dated to LMII or later to match the Mycenaean motifs of 354 and 359.<sup>5</sup>

- 
1. Compare the Great Lion Hunt on the Shaft Graves dagger. The huge lion is so valiant that he has already defeated one warrior and now lunges at the four remaining warriors. MARIN Pl. XXXV.
  2. On the problem of lions in Mycenaean art see below pp. 148-9, 153.
  3. THERA II, Back Cover. Boys boxing.
  4. PMI, Figs. 508, 511. Figs. 509, 510 give other boxing examples.
  5. However the shape of the dagger demands the earlier date. On the problem of an accurate date for the dagger see above p. 108, Fn. 6.

359. Lentoid Seal from Pylos - LHII-III.  
 Duel between a Warrior and a Boar.  
 The theme of 354 is now worked in a splendid circular design. The stretch of the hunting dog contributes to the circular movement.  
 There are the Warrior-Lion Duels in 144, 439 where the animals continue to be of heroic size and spirit.

The tradition of the Duel motif set in these early examples continues unabated till the end of the Mycenaean palaces.

355. Rectangular Seal from Pylos - LHIII.  
 Duel between two Warriors.  
 Here the motif is worked with the diagonal element exploited in the composition.
357. Fresco, Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Battle Scene.  
 The warriors are "paired off" as in Duels.
358. Fresco, Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 In this larger battle scene the fighting is conducted by way of a series of mini-duels as in 357 above.  
 The mortal blow is again a feature, though better shown in the pair not illustrated here.<sup>6</sup>
361. Lentoid Seal - Mycenaean.  
 Duel Scene.  
 This seal is too damaged to be sure of the composition but one duelling pair is clear.
362. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Duel Scene with Lions.  
 Two heroes grapple bare-handed with two monstrous lions. The theme is rendered in two Duels.

An interesting example from Cyprus shows the Mycenaean iconography.

360. Mirror Handle from Kouklia - Late Bronze Age.  
 Duel between a Warrior and a Lion.  
 The Duel, the fatal thrust, the huge lion are all standard iconographical features of the Mycenaean motif.  
 The Warrior-Griffin Duel 485 is treated in the same style. However the Warrior and the lion in the Syrian seal 179 only faintly recall Mycenaean features.

The battle and the hunt are favourite Mycenaean themes and they are usually rendered by means of the Duel motif. These Mycenaean Duels have three distinctive features. Firstly the protagonists are

---

6. PMII Pl. M. 22H64.

Mabel Lang has acknowledged the duel concept in her description for each of these scenes. She calls 357 "Duel Plus" p. 73 and 358 "Duomachy and Mass Murder" p. 71.

To date, such battle scenes seem a Mainland topic as Minoan frescoes do not provide such examples and the Thera frescoes so far give us only a sea battle and troops landing. THERA VI Colour Plate 7, Miniature Frescoes, West House.

either two great warriors or a warrior and an animal raised to heroic proportions in order to be a meet adversary for the hero. Secondly the stage of the Duel most favoured for portrayal is the point of delivery of the fatal thrust. Thirdly, though it is often clear who will be the victor in the Duel, there is never any suggestion that he has had an effortless win. On the contrary he always appears in great danger, sometimes suffering grievous wounds.

In each of these features the Mycenaean tradition contrasts strongly with battle portrayals of the eastern traditions. There, the preference seems to be for preparation before battles like the marching out of troops and chariots or the symbolic statement of victory afterwards as in the scenes of the sacrificing of prisoners. When actual battle scenes are shown as in the vast compositions of the New Kingdom, Pharaoh in his chariot reins in his horses rearing up over a melee of confused bodies. When a hunt is shown, the confused bodies are replaced by a tangle of lion carcasses but the import of the scene remains constant, the invincibility and invulnerability of the King.<sup>7</sup>

In the 14th and 13th centuries a few instances of the Duel motif appear in the East like the static rendering on the Syrian seal already mentioned or the more spirited warrior versus lion combat on the Alaca Huyuk relief.<sup>8</sup>

However the true Mycenaean Duel motif, that one to one combat full of danger, dramatically portrayed at the moment of the mortal blow, has no real parallels in eastern art.<sup>9</sup>

7. Below Chapter 4, War, Hunt, and the Chariot, pp. 142-5.

8. AKUR 95. A warrior confronts a huge rearing lion attacked by two dogs. The whole spirit of the piece reminds one strongly of Mycenaean Duels.

9. The one to one confrontations that appear in the earlier Contest Scenes completely lack these elements of danger and imminent death. Above Chapter 2 pp. 30-4.

### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Bull Sports

This motif is originally Minoan and is best known in the Bull Leaping Fresco from the Knossos palace but there are other scenes of bull capture which should also be included under the Bull Sports motif. Evans<sup>1</sup> described the various bull leaping and bull capture scenes and more recently Sakellariou,<sup>2</sup> Tamvaki,<sup>3</sup> and Younger<sup>4</sup> have dealt with the subject. This study follows Sakellariou and Tamvaki in accepting two types of scenes, the "bull-grappling" and the "bull-leaping". The former involves the capture of the bull as in 363 and the latter the spectacular portrayal of the bull-vaulter's somersault as in 364 to 366.

- 363. Gold Cup from Vaphio - LHII.  
The whole cup decoration is a Mycenaean treatment of the bull capture.<sup>5</sup>
- 364. Signet Ring from Asine - LHII-III.  
Athlete leaping a Bull.  
Characteristically the bull is in the Flying Gallop and the athlete in Minoan male garb, possibly Minoan work. Other examples include the Tiryns Bull Leaping Fresco 319 where the leaper is apparently female, and the fine Minoan bronze of a male leaper.<sup>6</sup>
- 365. Amygdaloid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
Athlete leaping a Bull.  
The scene is now well-handled.
- 366. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Athlete leaping a Bull.  
This sealing shows the spirited rendering of the motif and Minoan details used in such a way as to argue Minoan workmanship for the original seal, as in 317.

- 
- 1. PMIII, pp. 203-32.
  - 2. SAKELLARIOU (1958).
  - 3. TAMVAKI (1974), pp. 277-82, "The Bull Games". A most useful summary of earlier works.
  - 4. YOUNGER (1976). A discussion of the acrobats and a full catalogue of examples of the Bull Leaping motif.
  - 5. DAVIS (1977) pp. 1-50 convincingly argues this "Violent Cup" is the Mycenaean companion piece to the "Quiet Cup" wrought in Minoan style.
  - 6. HIGGINS (1967) p. 6, a 16th century piece.

Some eastern compositions with animal scenes seem to follow the Aegean animal poses used in the Bull Sports motif but do not portray the true Bull Sports.

367. Gaming Box from Enkomi - c13th C.<sup>7</sup>

Bull with Lowered Horn and other designs.

The bull at bay, ready to attack with lowered horn becomes a quite often used detail in the Late Bronze Age and is seen again in 219 and 324.

The scene may reflect the Aegean use of the motif.

Other examples from the East with some recollection of the Bull Sports motif are the cylinder seal from Syria showing a bull leaping scene<sup>8</sup> and the box from Egypt.<sup>9</sup> There is also a scene in the Temple of

Seti I at Abydos showing Ramesses II roping bulls and one at Medinet Habu showing Ramesses III hunting wild bulls.<sup>10</sup>

The motif of the Bull Sports is characteristically Aegean more especially Minoan, and it develops in its iconography two variations, the bull-leaping and bull-grappling scenes. The bull-leaping scenes find isolated faint parallels in eastern art with some reflection of the Minoan iconography. The bull-grappling scenes may also have faint parallels in the East but the iconographical detail is not close to the Aegean representations and there appears to be more interest in a "bull-hunt" or a "bull at bay" motif.

---

7. KANTOR (1947a) p. 93 discusses the piece.

The date given is a stylistic date in preference to the date of the tomb in which the box was found, early 12th C. The style is close to the Ugarit Bowl 502, FRANK AA pp. 150-2.

8. SEYRIG (1956) p. 169. The pose of both man and beast is static, a faint echo only of the spirited Aegean compositions.

9. KANTOR (1947a) Pl. XX.2. Recognizable as the Aegean motif, more so than the cylinder design above.

10. Ramesses II and his son are on foot, MICH 509.  
Ramesses III rides in a chariot, MICH 553.

### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Fish, Dolphin, Octopus, Nautilus

These four marine motifs have a wide usage in the Aegean from Middle Minoan times.<sup>1</sup> Examples 368 to 373 show the forms down to the end of the Mycenaean age.

368. Pithos from Phaestos - MMII.  
Fish.  
This is an early example of the Minoan artists' delight in marine forms.
369. Dagger from Prosymna - LHII.  
Dolphin in Niello.  
This shows the dolphin with colours carefully wrought. The later seal 92 shows leaping dolphins flanking a Mistress of Animals, and the frescoes from Thera and Kea<sup>2</sup> show dolphins similar to 369.
370. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Octopus.  
The octopus is shown in characteristic Mycenaean fashion, its tentacles all neatly "combed-out", curled, and symmetrically arranged. It is a contrast to the organic swirling of the Minoan octopus, all torsional energy.<sup>3</sup>
371. Fresco Pieces from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Nautilus Frieze.  
This border pattern shows the nautilus treated in a stylized manner.  
As in 274A, 369 and 370, there is no suggestion of the habitat of these marine creatures. The earlier cup 380 does show a marine background.
372. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Fish and Octopus.  
Furumark's Motives 20 Fish and 21 Cuttlefish.  
There is also an octopus on the LMIII sarcophagus 255.
373. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
Nautilus.  
Furumark's Motive 22 Argonaut.  
In 372 and 373 the increasing stylization of the motifs is clear. The designs on the Pylos floor 256 provide additional examples.

- 
1. FURU pp. 143-6 includes these four motifs among others of his Marine Cycle. Furumark uses the names cuttlefish and argonaut where octopus and nautilus are used here.
  2. The Ship Fresco, THERA VI C.P.9.  
Dolphin Fresco, COLEMAN (1973) Pl. 56.
  3. MARIN 87.  
For the treatment of marine representations in Minoan pottery designs see FURU pp. 145-8, 160-1, and WALBERG (1976) Fig. 48, 25 (v) 1-3, 5; Fig. 49, 28.7.

These marine motifs are originally Minoan creations which are taken into Mainland art where they are used until the end of the period. They become increasingly stylized, their usage being more as decorative patterns than organic forms, and in this usage they are often depicted without any suggestion of their marine habitat.

In the East, Egyptian art depicts fish from Pre-Dynastic times. Early examples show the fish as a separate design worked on amulets, palettes, and white cross-lined pottery design.<sup>4</sup> Fish are depicted in naturalistic detail in Old Kingdom Wall paintings where they are placed in their natural habitat, the Nile.<sup>5</sup> This naturalistic portrayal is found in all periods. Early in the Mesopotamian tradition fish swim in the Flowing Stream,<sup>6</sup> and occasionally fish appear in Syrian work as in the Byblos dagger sheath<sup>7</sup> or in a very stylized form on Mitannian seals.<sup>8</sup> However these depictions are not close in iconographical detail to the Aegean motifs. Only in some Cypriot seals where a leaping dolphin or an octopus is found<sup>9</sup> is there a reflection of the Aegean marine motifs.

---

4. PETRIE (1914) pp. 49-50, Pl. XLIII.  
 PETRIE (1920) pp. 13-6, 36-8, Pls. XXII 2, XLIII 35-54.

5. See 421.

6. See 329, 345.

7. BYB.D 14443.

8. See 277B, 278B. They are in fact so stylized it is hard to see their exact form. Buchanan calls them fish, BUCH p. 185.

9. See 325, 340.



### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Tri-curved Arch

This motif takes the form of a Scale Pattern with the convex edge of the scale pushed out to form an extra curve. The motif is used both as a convention for water and rocky shallows and as a decorative pattern. Both uses are known in Minoan art from LMI<sup>1</sup> times on and later in Mycenaean art.

374. Rhyton Fragments from Mycenae - LHI.

Tri-curved Arch Pattern.

The Siege Rhyton from the Shaft Graves shows the motif used as the convention for water or rocky shallows.

It shows also a regular variant of the motif, the extra curve at the base of each arch.

375. Fresco Fragment from Pylos - LHIIIB.

Tri-curved Arch Pattern.

This example shows the decorative use of the all-over pattern. The Papyrus fill is a regular variant.<sup>2</sup>

376. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.

Tri-curved Arch.

Furumark's Motive 62 Tri-curved Arch. The motif is used for separate elements as well as the all-over pattern.

This motif remains distinctively Aegean in character and does not have any real parallels in the artistic designs of the East. The few examples that are found outside Greece and Crete may all be imports from the Aegean.<sup>3</sup>

- 
1. Evans, PMII pp. 312-4, wishes to take the MMII example of the Town Mosaic as the prototype for this motif - at least for its usage as a convention for water or rocky shallows. The particular pieces of the Mosaic he cites are the pale green faience scales and though they are regular in form, without the extra curve, he may well be right with this suggestion, particularly in view of the colour. However, I cannot unequivocally accept his assertion that these scales form a Scale Mountain since the circumstances of the find preclude any certain reconstruction of the composition and he cannot have both mountain and seascape.
  2. Note also the late example of the Tri-curved Arch on a sarcophagus, MAJEWSKI (1964) Pls. 1, 2.
  3. KANTOR (1947a) pp. 99-101 discusses the possible transference of the motif to Asia and lists a total of six examples all in ivory from Troy, Enkomi, Minet el Beida and Megiddo. Of these, two may be Mycenaean imports and three others would fall under my listing of motifs as "Marbling". The sixth from Enkomi could of course also be a Mycenaean import. In addition she notes the red porphyry lamp from Atchana which is an undoubted import. See also ALAL Pl. LXXIX. For an illustration of one of Enkomi examples see 367.

### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Rocky Landscape, Glen

In an endeavour to depict their mountainous terrain satisfactorily, Aegean artists used a variety of methods from free-form loop designs to much tighter arrangements resembling a Scale Pattern. Examples 377 to 382 show the main types from LMI to LHIIIB.

377. Fresco from Thera - LMIA.  
Rocky Landscape with Birds and Flowers.<sup>1</sup>  
The "Spring Fresco" shows one of the free landscape renderings. The rocks take various shapes and different hues and are marked with free-form loops. Another Theran landscape is seen in 450.
378. Signet Ring from Vaphio - LHII.  
Cult Scene amid Rocks.  
Minoan style. The man stands on rocks rendered as a cluster of pebbles. The tree grows out of another cluster as in 339.
379. Design on a Cup from Dendra - LHII-III.  
Swans Flying over a Rocky Landscape.  
The landscape is tightly stylized and resembles a Scale Pattern.
380. Gold Cup from Midea - LHII-III.  
Rocky Seascape with Marine Creatures.  
This example also renders the rocky shallows or the sea waves with something approaching a Scale Pattern. The "scales" are not however evenly arranged and some are of an elongated shape. This use is similar to that of the Tri-curved Arch motif in 374.
381. Signet Ring from Perati - LHIII.  
Animals in a Rocky Landscape.  
This appears to be a disintegration of the above landscape forms with only separate "pebbles" marked.
382. Fresco Fragments from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
Birds Flying through a Glen.<sup>2</sup>  
This is the most stylized of all the landscape forms. The rocks are worked in clusters as in 378 and are variegated and striated as in 377. However what constitutes the Glen motif is their use both at top and bottom of the picture as if to indicate the scene is set in a mountain defile and the background of rocks seems to be below, behind and above the figures. The Glen motif is seen also in 352, 354, 363.

Neither of these two Aegean motifs appear to have found a lasting home in eastern art.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. PMII pp. 450-4 gives a discussion on "Rock Landscapes".

2. The term is coined here and used in preference to other less descriptive terms.

3. For landscape treatment in some Dynasty XVIII examples see below p. 131.

### 3 OTHER MOTIFS IN EASTERN OR AEGEAN ART

#### Marbling, Colour Waves

These two motifs are regularly used in Minoan and Mycenaean art from LMI to LHIII. The term "Colour Waves" is the name given here to the device for varying the background colour in frescoes.<sup>1</sup> The Marbling motif is, as Evans has explained, an imitation of the beautifully veined gypsum and alabaster stones available in Crete.<sup>2</sup> He draws our attention to the Partridge Fresco from Knossos, where the landscape is handled in looped forms with coloured striations and where there are even little pebbles with variegated stripes.<sup>3</sup> The Marbling motif is also used by itself as a decorative all-over pattern particularly for borders and dadoes. Examples 383 to 388 show the usage of the motif in the Aegean and the East down to the end of the 13th Century.

383. Fragments of Paintings from Qatna - 1700-1400?  
Marbling on a Border.  
The motif is handled in the characteristic Aegean manner. The earlier Mari example 289 and the later Pylos example 406<sup>4</sup> provide closely comparable detail.
384. Dagger Blade from Mycenae - LHI.  
Lion Running through a Glen.  
In this composition the Glen motif is rendered by Marbling.
385. Lentoid Seal from Midea - LHII-III.  
Animal Attack in a Rocky Landscape.  
The rocks are shown by Marbling, the veining lines arranged this time in a single row. The similarity of this form of the motif to the Tri-curved Arch (admittedly a much more precise design) has led Kantor to include such examples in her Tri-curved Arch classification. However it seems better to list this rather free motif separately.<sup>5</sup>

- 
1. See also Lang's Glossary PNII p. 34, "Zone-changing lines".
  2. PMI p. 356, PMIV pp. 893-6.
  3. PMII Frontispiece and pp. 109-16. He rightly compares this frieze with the desert scenes from the Tomb of Kenamun at Thebes PMII pp. 448-50.
  4. Compare also the frescoes from Alalakh, ALAL Pls. XXXVI, XXXVII.
  5. Thus I would compare her eastern examples like 367 with 385, 386.

386. Lentoid Seal from Mycenae - Undated.  
Goddess Riding across a Rocky Landscape.  
The landscape is worked by Marbling with a single row of veining as in 385.
387. Fresco Dado, Pylos - LHIII B.  
Marbling Pattern.  
This decorative use of the Marbling motif fills panels on Pylos frescoes.<sup>6</sup>
388. Fresco from Pylos - LHIII B.  
Colour Waves in a Hunting Scene.  
This shows the most formal use of the Aegean convention for changing background colour in frescoes. Other Pylos examples include 358, 404, 429, 434 and the earlier examples are 443, 143.

The use of these various landscape and background conventions is prevalent in the Aegean, but sparse in the East. In the tomb of Kenamun at Thebes<sup>7</sup> the hunt is depicted in a landscape which is not of the Egyptian formula but which resembles the freely treated Aegean scenes rendered by the Rocky Landscape and Marbling motifs. Animals shelter in "burrows" formed by striations of colour and the whole scene is reminiscent of Minoan or Theran landscapes. The Marbling motif is clearly seen in eastern examples as early as the Mari Palace and as late as the Enkomi ivory box.

---

6. There are also some with variegated pebbles just like ones in the Partridge Frieze. See PNII 14D nws, Pl. Q and pp. 33 where Lang lists them as "Easter-egg stones".

7. DAVIES (1930), and DAVIES (1936) Pls. XXX, XXXI.  
Designs which imitate stone have been known in Egypt since pre-historic times, PETRIE (1920) pp. 17-8, Pls. XIX-XXII, but the spotted effect is one reflecting more the composition of granite or conglomerate.

## The Human Figure

The representation of man in ancient art is a vast subject and the discussion of this motif limits itself to one aspect of the whole problem, that of the conventions for rendering standing and seated figures in two-dimensional art types.<sup>1</sup> These poses are sometimes rendered in profile, occasionally fully frontal, but most often in a combination pose where some of the body is shown in profile, some frontal, with a twist to reconcile the two. The conventions for each type of pose are laid down in the early figurative art of each area.

In Egyptian art the canon for the standing figure is a special combination pose. The head is profile with full-front eye; the shoulders are frontal; the upper chest is profile showing one nipple of the breast while the torso is twisted to show the navel on almost three-quarter view; the legs are profile with the feet well apart and always showing the inside of the foot.<sup>2</sup> These features also apply to the seated figure with the exception that the legs and feet are brought together giving a distinct angle at the knees. A full profile is permitted for some depictions of Pharaoh and for some gods but otherwise the canon holds for all principal figures, and it is one of the most characteristic features of Egyptian art.

389. Stele - Dyn. XI.

Standing Figures of the Priest-Lector Indy and his Wife.  
The Egyptian canon as seen also in 203, 251, 431A, B.  
The representation problem caused by this combination of full face and profile aspects is most acute at the level of the breast when the figure wears a necklace.

---

1. Including relief sculpture and glyptic.

2. SMITH OK pp. 273-332 gives a full treatment of the canon.  
For the grid lines see also MICH p. 569.

The necklace must lie symmetrically about the neck and rest on each shoulder but by the time its pendulous loop reaches the chest, the body has twisted 90° and the jewels sit frontally on a profile breast. It is a tribute to the skill of the Egyptian artists that in spite of this difficulty the whole figure is still convincing. The shoulder straps of the women create a similar problem, 205. The other alignment problem which can arise in the combination convention is at the waist but this has already been solved by the Egyptian when he turned the torso profile higher up. His three-quarter view at the waist allows the navel to be directly above the centre of the kilt over-lap which starts from the edge of the figure and swings across the abdomen to the other leg, 330. Attention should also be given to 47 an example from Byblos. It looks decidedly Egyptian but does not follow the canon exactly. The torso is handled in the Mesopotamian convention.

390. Drawing Exercise - Dyn. XVIII.

Drawing Exercise: The Seated Figure.

The seated figure follows the same rules as for the standing figure except that the legs are placed together with only a line etched between to indicate there are two. There is usually a space between legs and chair and the whole effect is one of slimness - a narrow lap and a definite angle at the bend of the knees, 250. The Byblos piece 204 follows the canon.

391. Lintel Relief from Karnak - Dyn. XII.

Sesostris III in the Heb Sed Pavilion.

In this ritual Pharaoh is shown in full profile, his cape covering all detail, though the angle at the bend of the knees is still clear. Some Heb Sed representations follow the normal canon as in 52 while gods like Ptah and Osiris and the deceased are sometimes shown in the profile convention as in 431A, B.

The fully frontal portrayal is very rare in Egyptian art except for Bes and the Hathor Heads.

The Mesopotamian tradition appears much more flexible. It sometimes uses a profile convention, sometimes a fully frontal convention, but most often a combination pose with the body twist at the waist.

392. Stele Fragment - Imp. Akk. II-III.

Fettered Prisoners.

This is one of the most naturalistic treatments of the profile type in Mesopotamian art.

393. Limestone Mace - Ur I.

Standing Figure of Eannatum.

This example shows the most frequently used convention for the human figure in Mesopotamian art, the combination pose. The head is profile, eyes frontal. The upper torso is frontal and there is a 90° swivel at the waist to render the lower torso in profile. Other examples include 33, 34,

209, 329, 335, 338, 346, 459 and the Cyprus seal 78. One variation of this convention is to have the face always fully frontal as in 4, 6, 61, 62, 345 and also the Syrian seal 64B.

394. Relief Plaque from Telloh - Ur I.

Seated Figure of Ur-Nanshe.

This is the usual seated pose. Basically the body is handled in the same way as for the standing figure but now with the profile lower torso in seated position and covered by a ballooning skirt, the whole effect is one of bulkiness. The capacious lap, the billowing curve at the knee and feet drawn quite separately all contrast markedly with the Egyptian canon of the seated figure. The full length costumes of later times help to streamline the figure somewhat but the true thigh line is still obscured by the sweeping line of the dress as it flows down, carefully following the line of the chair. This is seen in 11, 12, 150, 337, 347, 432. The full length robe was also an aid in over-coming the problem of alignment which occurs in this combination pose because of the waist swivel.

395. Relief of a Goddess - Larsa Period.

Standing Figure of a Winged Goddess.

This fully frontal pose may be occasioned by the relief being the cult object.<sup>3</sup> However a naked or partly clothed goddess is frequently shown in this pose on seals as in Mitannian seal 65. Sometimes the head is turned to the side as in the Syrian examples 3, 152A. This frontal convention for the Nude Goddess continues on down into the Late Bronze Age with the 14th-13th century examples 196 from Ugarit and 280 from Cyprus.

When the Aegean conventions are fully manifest in Late Palatial Minoan art they reveal both a profile pose and a combination pose. Mycenaean conventions are largely inherited from Minoan prototypes.

396. Fresco from Thera - LMIA.

Standing Figure of a Fisherman.

This example shows the Aegean combination convention, a profile head with frontal eye, upper torso frontal, lower torso profile.<sup>4</sup> Other Minoan and Thera examples include 67A, B, 68A, B, 237. The waist transition is not a problem here as it is in figures with complicated Minoan clothing 161, 339.

3. The fully frontal convention is also used for the demon Humbaba.

4. Earlier representations of the human figure appear in isolated Kamares designs but they are usually quite stylized, WALBERG Fig. 49, 25 Pictorialized Motifs vi 1-4. One figure does show the combination pose, Fig. 49, 26 Pictorial Motifs 1.

- 397A. Miniature Fresco from Knossos - MMIII-LMI.  
Minoan Ladies Seated.  
Neither "seated" nor "kneeling" is an accurate description of the poses here. They are in fact sitting with their legs tucked up under them. The head, eye and upper torso are shown normally for the combination convention with the exception of the second lady whose breasts are not rendered in the usual way of indicating two nipples.<sup>5</sup>
- 397B. Rhyton Fragment from Knossos - MMIII-LMI.  
Standing Figure of a Minoan Man.  
This offering-bearer is shown in profile pose. The sway back becomes a characteristic Minoan feature. Whether it developed to fit a profile chest and arms behind a large gift or whether it is a legacy from the twisting vaulting figures of the bull leapers or results from an inability to portray the well-endowed Cretan ladies without throwing back their shoulders, there is no way of knowing. Other profile poses include 22, 79, 89, 349, 462. When the Minoan male wears a kilt instead of the cod-piece, the centre front of the kilt falls down the profile edge of the figure.<sup>6</sup>
- 398A. Bead Seal from Knossos - MMIII.  
This profile face with frontal eye on a seal from the Little Palace is rendered in the conventional way. However neither the beard nor the hair-style is characteristically Minoan.
- 398B. Discoid Seal from Mycenae - LHI.  
Male Head.  
This design shows a bearded man with short straight hair in the Mycenaean fashion.

As the Late Bronze Age advances the conventions already established in each area continue to be followed.

399. Painted Pillar, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Standing Figure of Amenhotep II and Hathor.

- 
5. CAMERON (1971) p. 37 discusses problems of pose among others in his article on a fresco piece which helps with the understanding of the "Ladies in Blue" composition.
6. PMII Pl. XII The Cup Bearer Fresco, and Fig. 450C The Procession Fresco give the best examples. The treatment of the codpiece in profile on the outer edge of the lower torso thus fixing the centre front of the belt on the outline of figure may have shaped the convention for the treatment of kilts where the centre front of the kilt and its tassel continues down along the outline. Whether the heavy embroidered kilt weighted in the front with the fringe was inclined to hang this way rather than swing back with the leg or whether it was simply an artistic convention there is no way of knowing. Whatever the reason for the depiction its contrast to the Egyptian depiction of the loin cloth is immediately apparent.



The canon is strictly observed in this painting with again the single nipple shown.<sup>7</sup> Other examples are 205, 251, 421.

400. Gate Relief from Hattusas - Hittite Empire.

Standing Figure of a Hittite God.

There are some unusual features in the combination pose here. The head is profile and so is the eye. The upper torso is frontal with both nipples shown and the lower torso is profile. The Hittite treatment of the problem of the waist swivel is very clear. The belt buckle which clasps at the centre and has the overlap fringe falling diagonally away from it should be placed centrally to align it with the centre of the diaphragm muscles of the full-front chest. It is however placed off to the side and so helps to fit in with the profile leg. This is of course exactly the Egyptian treatment of positioning the overlap of the kilt at the navel position and letting it swing back diagonally with the other leg. Examples 37, 219, and 344 and 433 give the profile pose.

401. Vase Fragments from Ugarit - 14th C.

Standing Figures of a King and a Lady.

The man's head is handled conventionally and the woman's figure according to the Egyptian canon. The whole composition has a decidedly Egyptian cast as do the panels in 196. Both however betray their Syrian origin by mismanaging aspects of the complicated Egyptian iconography.

402. Engraved Inlay from Megiddo - 14th C.

Standing Figures and Seated Figure.

The figures follow the Mesopotamian profile and combination conventions. In 208 some figures have raised "Egyptian" hands. The Cyprus examples 84, 85A, 102, 271, 280 use the iconographical details of the combination and profile poses.

403. Fresco from Pylos - LHIIIB.

Standing Figure of a Woman.

This shows the expected combination pose except for the breast. Only one is shown and that in profile, with the nipple also in profile. This feature further complicates the problem of reconciling the centrefront of the bodice, waist, and skirt. An interesting detail is that the woman is smelling a flower. Now the unusual feature on this example should not be thought to indicate any great divergence from Minoan conventions. Indeed as far as the depiction of the human figure is concerned Mycenaean conventions closely follow Minoan.

---

7. Rare examples of a frontal breast in Egyptian art include a dancer, MICH 753, and a servant in the New Kingdom, MICH 94. Stevenson Smith of course reminds us, "a certain latitude was always allowed for the representation of children, peasants, captives, and above all, animals". SMITH OK p. xiv and he quotes a frontal representation of a girl as the balance of a set of scales p. 207.

404. Fresco from Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Standing Figure of a Man.  
 An offering-bearer is rendered in the profile convention with the characteristic sway back. Other examples in the profile convention with and without the sway back are 388, 418, 428, 429, 434.
- 405A. Amygdaloid Seal from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
 Standing Figure of a Man.  
 This seal shows the standard combination pose and should be compared to 71, 72, 76, 163, 164.
- 405B. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.  
 Standing Figures.  
 Three women votaries are drawn in the profile convention as in 43 and 89.  
 When the female figure is not a votary but is the focus of attention, the combination convention is used often slightly changed to show the whole body more frontally positioned, only the head and feet being truly profile. Examples are 36, 45, 81, 82, 91, 92, 147. This use should be compared to the use discussed under 395.<sup>8</sup>
406. Fresco in the Throne Room, Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Seated Figure of a Minstrel.  
 This time the basically profile convention is helped by nature of the long straight robe as in 87, 124, 143.
407. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
 Standing Figures.  
 Furumark's Motive 1 Man which appears in this period. He draws attention to both Minoan and Mycenaean characteristics.<sup>9</sup> Both the profile and combination poses are used and many figures show the sway back.<sup>10</sup>
408. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
 Human Heads.  
 Furumark's Motive 1 Man, Head Types.  
 All follow the convention of profile head, frontal eye.

Before a comparison of the iconography of the poses is drawn, two other points are worthy of consideration, the first being the size of the figures. The convention of depicting the main figure of a scene as much larger than subsidiary figures, which is such a feature of Egyptian art, is not regularly found in other arts. Only in some

---

8. A link between the two traditions may be indicated by the little naked figures on the gold ornaments from Mycenae, MARIN 205.

9. FURU pp. 237-42.

10. Also seen on some Minoan Genius figures, 143, 145.

Hittite compositions where a God protects the king, 344, and in a late Pylos fresco<sup>11</sup> with one figure in a procession, 434, is there any parallel to this Egyptian gradation of importance by size.

Secondly, in the matter of skin colour, each tradition seems to have its own conventions. The Egyptian had several colours for skin; usually red-brown for men, yellow for women and gods, and blue, green or black for special gods.<sup>12</sup> However there are many variations.

A group of male figures drawn in the Egyptian manner of overlapping may have the bodies coloured alternately in light brown and red-brown. When a woman is in the company of goddesses they may be yellow and she may be brown. In the case of foreigners, Asiatics may be yellow, negroes black, and Cretans the same red-brown as Egyptian men. The Mesopotamian tradition, at least so far as the Mari frescoes inform us, gives one skin-colour, reddish-brown, to all humans and gods.<sup>13</sup> The Aegean colour conventions are red-brown for males and white for females with occasionally a black figure depicted.<sup>14</sup> There seems to be little correlation between the three traditions unless one wishes to see in the brown/white convention for Aegean males/females a reflection of the Egyptian "general rule" of brown/yellow.

The survey of human figure poses reveals that all traditions share several features in common. All make use of the profile head with frontal eye and profile feet showing the inside. All make some

- 
11. PNII 13H5. A white-robed male figure is larger than the rest of the figures. Note also the great size of the bull.
  12. Like Osiris. On the interchange of blue green and black in Egyptian colour conventions see SMITH OK p. 258.
  13. See PARR 348A for the exception. One fisherman has white skin and another fragment shows a white leg. Hittite relief sculpture does not appear to have these colour problems but a piece of poly-chrome pottery relief shows red-brown skins. AKUR Pl. XIV.
  14. At Knossos and Pylos.

use of the profile convention and the frontal convention. However, the Mesopotamian and Aegean traditions share another two features. Both use a profile convention and a combination convention as regular alternatives, and the combination convention is basically the same in both. The Egyptian canon remains peculiarly Egyptian and when its forms are attempted in the Syrian area the local artists usually misinterpret some feature. The Syrian artists are also familiar with the Mesopotamian conventions and these spread right through to Cyprus with glyptic art.

On the point of specific detail of features or subjects there are some interesting parallels in Aegean and eastern art. In the fresco from Pylos 403 the figure of a woman is shown smelling a flower, with profile breast in combination pose, all Egyptian details.<sup>15</sup> Some Aegean depictions of female figures as in 36, 81, 82 appear to reflect the frontal treatment of the Mesopotamian Naked Goddess.<sup>16</sup> In addition the Mycenaean seated figures in long robes as with 406 look decidedly Mesopotamian. However one should note by contrast that the characteristic Aegean feature, the sway back is not seen in the East.

---

15. See illustration 203 and above p. 81 FN 20.

16. Also MARIN 205.

## Borders

Many border motifs including the Guilloche, Linked Circles, Running Spiral, Rosette band, and Marbling have already been discussed but several others deserve attention. The Diamond Band is one from the Mesopotamian tradition seen as early as the Ur Standard, 415, and again at Mari, 347, and Nuzi, 454. The Aegean has a Foliate Band like pairs of leaves unfolding, 129, 360, and a Beam-end Frieze 108, 230. From Old Kingdom times Egypt uses for borders a plain band 244, and a long thin Chain, 245, 293,<sup>1</sup> as well as many designs made up of the elaborate Egyptian symbols, 250, 409. However none of these develop a wide usage outside their own areas. Two others, the Barred Band and the Checkerboard, by contrast are found in many places. Examples 409 to 412 show the standard Egyptian usages and Syrian comparisons are listed.

- 409. Wall Painting, Deir el Medineh - Dyn. XIX.  
Barred Bands and other designs.  
This example shows the long used border patterns.  
There are two types of Barred Band, the one of thin even stripes and the one below it where the bars are of different lengths which is one of the most common Egyptian border patterns. Examples are 245, 250, 399. Both types are used on the primeval kiosk in 13, 15. This is taken up in the Byblos imitation 204.
- 410. False Door Design from Bersheh - Dyn. XII.  
Checkerboard and other designs.  
A variety of geometrical patterns.
- 411. Wall Painting, Malkata - Dyn. XVIII.  
Barred Bands and other designs.  
The Barred Bands edge the Rosette border. Aegean borders have similar designs.
- 412. Ceiling Detail, Malkata - Dyn. XVIII.  
Checkerboard and other designs.  
The checkerboard is like 410.

---

1. SMITH OK pp. 260-1 believes it is a formal rendering of a panther tail.

The Aegean also regularly uses both the Barred Band and the Checkerboard in the Middle and the Late Bronze Age.<sup>2</sup>

413. Fresco Frieze, Pylos - LHIII B.  
Barred Bands and other designs.  
This usage is sometimes called "tooth ornament" in the Aegean. It is well known in Minoan art before the Mycenaeans take it over though it is not used in the last phase at Pylos.<sup>3</sup>
414. Pottery Designs - LHIII B.  
Checkerboard.  
Furumark's Motive 56 Chequers which he believes is not Minoan but is one of the motifs "betraying influence of the native tradition".<sup>4</sup> Buch's Motifs 24 and 25 show the motif in MH pottery. The Checkerboard is used as a border pattern for frescoes 357, 429.

The Barred Band and Checkerboard are used in common in the Aegean and the East throughout most of the Bronze Age. Two iconographical details of interest are the increasing use in the Late Bronze Age in both the Aegean and the East of both motifs as borders for wall-paintings, and the appearance in 18th Dynasty Egypt of some examples used in conjunction with Rosette bands of Aegean style.<sup>5</sup>

---

2. Or possibly from as far back as Neolithic times.

3. See Lang's summary on border patterns PNII pp. 157-62 where she suggests their origin as "painted representations of mouldings". For the use of plain bands as borders see 199, 200, 371, 388. For the many indications of just such border patterns as dadoes copied on seals and signets see 36, 41, 43, 57, 81, 89, 103, 123, 124, 143, 172, 366, 440.

4. FURU p. 378 gives MH examples.

5. As in examples from Malkata, 411, 412.

#### 4 AEGEAN AND EASTERN ARTISTIC CONVENTIONS AND THEMES

##### War, Hunt, and the Chariot

The allied themes of war and the hunt are established early in each artistic tradition. In the Late Bronze Age both themes are popular. Examples 415 to 418 show the war theme.

415. Standard of Ur - ED.

Part of the War Side.

In this inlay three aspects of the war theme are shown; the battle itself, the taking of prisoners, the inspecting of prisoners by the king.<sup>1</sup> Comparisons are the prisoners on 392 and inspecting the prisoners 402. Other means of showing the victory theme in Mesopotamian art include depicting the King as victorious hero as in the Naram-Sin Stele<sup>2</sup> or in the smiting pose 328, 329, and depicting the war god as in the Hittite relief 400.<sup>3</sup>

416. Relief, Abu Simbel - Dyn. XIX.

Reliefs of the Battle of Kadesh.

Actual battle scenes become a favourite subject under the militant New Kingdom Pharaohs. In this example the old horizontal register system has been replaced by a "Cavalier Perspective" which Stevenson Smith explains is an imitation of the Aegean manner of recording visual impressions.<sup>4</sup> Of course the old ways of rendering the war theme continue. The "sacrificing of prisoners" theme, handled by Pharaoh in the smiting pose 327, is very much elaborated in the New Kingdom 330. The simple battle of the boats in the Old Kingdom 460 is also elaborated in the New Kingdom especially in the "Peoples of the Sea" defeat 464. The war theme can also be handled by the Sphinx and Griffin trampling enemies, 13, 15, and siege scenes with ladders and falling warriors are known from Dynasty V.<sup>5</sup>

417. Fresco Fragment from Mycenae - LHIII.

Warrior Falling Headlong.

Just such a motif is a regular device in Egyptian siege scenes.<sup>6</sup>

The usual way of handling large compositions in the Aegean is by a "Cavalier Perspective" or "Mountain View Perspective".<sup>7</sup> Actual battle scenes in Mycenaean art are handled by the Duel convention already discussed. Examples are 351, 352, 355, 357, 358, 361, 362.

---

1. For a detailed description of the three registers see STROM p. 397.

2. Stele of Naram-Sin STROM 122, 123.

3. Compare the earlier Stele of the Vultures, with Ningirsu, STROM 67.

4. SMITH IN pp. 165-79 "The Ramesside Battle Scenes". See also discussion of illustration 417.

5. SMITH OK pp. 207, 239-40. Figs. 85, 86.

6. Evans compares the siege scenes generally, PMIII pp. 101-6.

7. SMITH IN p. 63. "Cavalier Perspective", an anachronistic term as Smith points out, is not entirely satisfactory since it suggests a whole system of drawing not invented for centuries. It may be better to distinguish the Aegean method from the superimposed registers used in the East by coining a new descriptive term, "Mountain View Perspective". See also below pp. 154, 208.

The almost complete absence of the war theme in Minoan art is worthy of note.<sup>8</sup>

418. Crater from Mycenae - LHIIIC.1.

Line of Warriors Marching.

This example postdates the period under discussion but close comparisons from LHIIIB are the armed hunters from Pylos 388, and from LMIA is the fresco from Thera, the Landing of Troops.<sup>9</sup>

In scenes of the hunt there is necessarily much overlap of detail with war scenes. Examples 419 to 421 explore the types of hunt scenes in Mesopotamian and Egyptian art.

419. Lion Hunt Stele from Uruk - Early Sumerian.

The hunt is the subject of the earliest Sumerian stele but it does not become one of the grand Mesopotamian motifs until Assyrian times. It is found on plates at Mari<sup>10</sup> and on orthostat reliefs at Alaca Huyuk.<sup>11</sup> There is also the Syrian example of the ruler, dressed as Pharaoh, spearing a lion, 196.

420. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.

Hunting Scene, Tomb of Puimre.

Puimre served both Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III and his tomb is one of several to show Aegean details in the depiction of animals in hunting scenes.

421. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.

Hunting Scene, Tomb of Nebamon.

This is an example of the traditional "fowling in the marshes" scene, that delightful variant of the hunt theme possible only in Egypt.

The Aegean cats on the Mycenae dagger 505, the Pylos comb,<sup>12</sup> and the Arkhanes seal<sup>13</sup> share some of the precise Egyptian iconography seen in 421.

Aegean hunting scenes have been partially discussed under the Mycenaean Duel motif where it was seen that one of the means of portraying the hunt is to depict it as a combat between a hero and an animal of formidable proportions and ferocity as in 359, 360, 439.

---

8. Evans lists four examples of warriors. The "Captain of the Blacks", Town Mosaic, Miniature fresco from Knossos, Prince on the Hagia Triada cup. PMII pp. 755-6, PMIII pp. 31, 81-8.

9. THERA VI Colour Plate 7. The marching warriors wear boars tusk helmets and carry rectangular "man-covering" shields and very long spears.

10. PARROT (1959) 1032, 1037.

11. AKUR 94, 96B Stag and Boar Hunt, 95 Lion Hunt.

12. MARIN Pl. 222.

13. PMIV Fig. 582.



This may have influenced the Syrian seal 179. Larger compositions of hunt scenes are known from frescoes like the Boar Hunt at Tiryns 318 and the Stag Hunt at Pylos,<sup>14</sup> where the Flying Gallop is employed in their depiction.

The chariot, which makes its appearance all over the Near East in the Late Bronze Age naturally becomes a subject for art. Stevenson Smith in his summary of the use of chariotry points out its increasing popularity with the portrayal of grand compositions of chariot scenes in both Egypt and the Aegean in the 14th and 13th centuries.<sup>15</sup> Examples 422 to 430 gloss additional points.

- 422. Cylinder Seal, Old Syrian.  
Chariot Scene and other designs.  
Buchanan calls it the "chariot theme".<sup>16</sup>  
The essentials are 1 driver, 2 horses, 6 spoked wheels.  
The Syrian chariot usually has a 4 spoked wheel.
- 423. Grave Stele from Mycenae - LHI.  
Chariot Scene and other designs.  
A stele from the Shaft Graves, with the design rather clumsily executed. 1 driver, 1 horse, 4 spokes.<sup>17</sup>
- 424. Wall Relief, Karnak - Dyn. XIX.  
Sety I in his Chariot returning with Prisoners.  
The most elaborate treatment of the chariot theme comes from Egyptian art where in the New Kingdom the Pharaohs delighted in having themselves portrayed driving to the hunt or to war. The horses often rear up over a tangled mass of animals or enemies.  
1 driver, 2 horses, 6 spokes.  
The Megiddo ivory 402 shows a warrior in his chariot bringing bound prisoners before a ruler.
- 425. Lentoid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
Chariot Scene.  
The composition is a little awkward.  
2 men, 2 horses, 4 spokes.  
Minoan examples have agrimi pulling the chariot.<sup>18</sup>

- 
- 14. PNII Hunting Scene Room 43: 16-20 H43, 12-14 C43, Pls. 51, 121, 122, 133, B, M.
  - 15. SMITH in pp. 22-9. "Chariotry and the Age of International Relations". A most useful discussion on chariot use in the Late Bronze Age is given in LITTAUER (1972).  
SCHAEFFER (1936-7) also has some pertinent comments on the depiction of chariots in his discussion of a Mycenaean krater found at Ugarit. See also 430.
  - 16. BUCH p. 175.
  - 17. MYLONAS (1951) proposes that these chariot scenes represent the funeral games.
  - 18. PMIV Fig. 803. See also Evans' discussion on chariots PMIV pp. 808-25.

426. Rock Sculpture, Imankulu - Hittite Empire.  
 Weather God and other designs.  
 The weather god rides in the traditional cart as in 331A not the new invention, the chariot.  
 Generally Hittite kings had themselves portrayed in ritual scenes before their gods and so are on foot, not mounted in a chariot.  
 Egyptian battle reliefs show the enemy Hittites in their chariots with up to 3 men, 2 horses and 6 spokes as in 416.<sup>19</sup>  
 The Egyptian fighting chariots carry 2 men.
427. Cylinder Seal - Late Bronze Age.  
 Chariot Scene and other designs.  
 The chariot in a hunting scene.  
 2(?) men, 2 horses, 4(?) spokes.<sup>20</sup>  
 The Enkomi box 367 also shows the subject more clearly.
428. Wall Painting, Tiryns - LHIII.  
 Chariot Scene.  
 2 women, 2 horses, 4 spokes.
429. Fresco, Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Chariot Scene.  
 1 man, 4 spokes but the number of horses is not clear though their pose is static.  
 The pose of chariot horses is often in the Flying Gallop from the Shaft Graves signet to the Tiryns fresco.
430. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
 Chariot.  
 Furumark's Motive 39 Chariot.  
 All the chariots are of the dual type and have 4 spokes.  
 His Motive 2, Horses, shows that there are regularly two horses. Thus while all chariots have two horses the Mycenaean equipage matches the Egyptian fighting chariot in number of men and the Syrian in shape of wheel.

All three traditions depict war and the hunt but there appear to be close iconographical parallels only in small details like the Falling Warrior, Animal Attack, and the Cat Catching Wildfowl motifs. When the chariot appears it plays an important part in these but it is the Egyptians and Mycenaeans who favour the Chariot motif most, both creating extended hunt and war compositions around it. The Mycenaeans however, do not make use of the magnificent rearing horse of the Egyptian chariot tradition in spite of their love of spirited and striking poses.

---

19. Also SMITH IN Figs. 215-17 and MICH 551, 552 and Akurgal's discussion AKUR p. 65.

20. Kenna says one man, CCA3 p. 31, but there seems to be an archer as well as the driver.

### Ritual and the Gods

One aspect which all arts find it necessary to depict is the ritual associated with the gods. Examples 431 to 434 explore some of the characteristic aspects of each tradition.

- 431A. Papyrus Painting - Dyn. XIX(?).  
 Osiris as the Djed Pillar with Horus and Anubis.  
 The Egyptian gods are always strikingly portrayed.  
 Along with Pharaoh they form the most important  
 set of subject matter in Egyptian art. Examples are  
 52, 142, 239, 240, 245, 251, 391, 399 and the Syrian  
 compositions on Egyptian models 196, 204.
- 431B. Papyrus Painting - Dyn. XIX.  
 Anubis with the Mummy before the Tomb with Mourners.  
 The funerary cult is the other major topic for  
 Egyptian art.
- 432. Wall Painting, Mari - 18th C.  
 Men and Gods.  
 The gods wear the Horned Helmet of Divinity of the  
 Mesopotamian tradition but are otherwise in the same  
 form and colour as humans. Other section of the  
 painting is 347. The composition is similar to that  
 in use in glyptic. Other examples include 11, 12, 99B,  
 120, 150, 152A, 174A, B, 180, 267, 268, 328, 329, 331A,  
 B, 333, 335, 337, 338, 345, 346, 459 and the Cypriot  
 examples 157, 271, 280, 334B.
- 433. Rock Carvings, Yazilikaya - Hittite Empire.  
 The Meeting of the Gods.  
 The great gods wear the Horned Helmet of special  
 Hittite form. They are often posed on mountains or  
 on their animal familiar. Comparisons are 37, 219,  
 332, 334A, 344, 348, 400, 426, 451.
- 434. Reconstruction of Wall Painting, Pylos - LHIIIB.  
 Ritual Procession.  
 The figures are known and the scale of the large bull  
 and tall priest but the composition is conjectural.  
 Earlier Minoan examples 349, 397B are on a smaller scale.  
 Other examples of ritual may include the scenes with  
 altars or shrines 43, 161, 163, 164, 405B, the open-air  
 scenes 339, 378, the procession 143, the compositions  
 involving humans and Griffins 22, 124, and the woman  
 riding on the Minoan Dragon 386.

Leaving aside certain motifs with a religious or ritual content like the Master and Mistress of Animals, the Sacred Tree and Sacred Pillar, and the ewer-bearing Minoan Genius, which have already

been discussed, some general points about the artistic representations of ritual and the gods can be made. Firstly Syria adopts some Egyptian forms especially in the south, though it is also heir to the Mesopotamian traditions especially in its glyptic. The Hitties too follow Mesopotamian formulae for some of their gods' features but adapt them to create a specific Hittite iconography. In addition Cyprus is in touch with the Mesopotamian tradition through Syrian and Mitannian modifications to the original forms.

In all these matters the Aegean stands apart. Not only does it not share in any of the iconography of the eastern traditions, it does not clearly indicate gods or goddesses. Are the female figures which are the focus of attention in a scene goddesses or priestesses?<sup>1</sup> Are the young male figures votaries or portrayals of the god?<sup>2</sup> Altars and religious symbols and some apparently ritual scenes we have,<sup>3</sup> but neither in Minoan nor in Mycenaean art do we have anything to compare with the myriad depictions of gods and goddesses from the great pantheons of Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Syria, and Egypt.

- 
1. One thinks particularly of the Snake Goddesses PMI Frontispiece, Fig. 360 and of the Minoan gold and ivory statuettes PMIII Fig. 305, PMIV Frontispiece and of the little idols newly found in Mycenae.
  2. Particularly where he appears above the heads of onlookers.
  3. RUTKOWSKI (1972) pp. 59-66.

#### 4 AEGEAN AND EASTERN ARTISTIC CONVENTIONS AND THEMES

##### Animals, Bucrania

Animals are a regular subject for all the artistic traditions and the lion, the bull, and the goat or ibex are perhaps the most popular. Examples 435 to 440 look at the portrayals of the lion in the Aegean and the East.

435. Sphinx, Memphis - Dyn. XIX.

The Lion as a Sphinx.

As discussed above<sup>1</sup> the lion has a special role in Egypt in helping form the Sphinx and Griffin.

The examples 312, 314 are not characteristic of Egypt but exhibit iconographical details belonging to the Aegean Animal Style.

436. Limestone Statuette - Protoliterate.

Lion Demon.

Frankfort says it "stands at the head of a long line of monsters which appear in all the great periods of Mesopotamian art..."<sup>2</sup>

Apart from this fantastic element one should note its upright stance. Animals "in human attitudes" are a feature of early glyptic<sup>3</sup> as in 5. Other uses of the lion in the Mesopotamian and derivative traditions include heraldic lions 2, 3, 5, 48B, 174A, 212, the lion in ritual 33, 120, 180, 345, gods mounted on lions 268, 395, 433, and lion hunt 419. Cypriot examples are 84, 85A. There are also the lion and bull groupings in the early Contest Scenes, 6, 8, 32, 61, 62, 63, 64B.

437. Cylindrical Seal from Platanos - EMII-MMII.

Lions and Spiders in a Circle.

This is one of the many EM to MMII seals depicting lions.<sup>4</sup> The design on the other end of the seal shows three scorpions in a circle. Scorpions are regularly found in early Mesopotamian art.

- 
1. See above pp. 41, 47. On the detail of the shoulder ornament of Near-Eastern lions I refer readers to the literature on the subject KANTOR (1947b), ARKELL (1948), KANTOR (1950), BATE (1950), VAN BUREN (1950), VOLLGRAFF-ROES (1953).
  2. FRANK AA p. 13.
  3. AMIET pp. 107-10.
  4. CMS II.1 223a, 224a, 249, 250a, 251a, 252a, 253, 295a, b, 311b, 312a, 336a, 419, 497a. The seals 223 and 250 also use both lions and scorpions. The seal 411 shows an Animal Attack of advanced design and may be later in date. CMS XII.8 also shows two lions.
  5. AMIET p. 132 discusses scorpions, and p. 103 spiders. Fig. 253 shows scorpions and spiders in the same design.

438. Lion Gate at Hattusas - Hittite Empire.  
Hittite art takes up the long standing Mesopotamian use of lions as guardian figures.<sup>6</sup>  
For the lion in Hittite art as a mount for the god see 37, 43.
439. Amygdaloid Seal from Pylos - Undated.  
Duel between a Hero and a Lion.  
This treatment has already been discussed but it is worth noting again the size of the lion and its ferocity, seen here again and also in 144, 353, 360. The Mycenaean interest in exploiting the violence of the lion comes out clearly in the numerous animal attack scenes<sup>7</sup> so beloved of Mycenaean artists, 49, 176, 320, 385. Dogs substitute as attackers in 310, 315. The animal attack seems almost a further extension of the Duel. One feature of the treatment of these animal attacks is the extensive use of the Flying Gallop to render the aggressive speed of the attacker or the terrified flight of its quarry, 49, 176, 310, 315, 316, 318, 320, 385. A second feature of the animal attack is the use of the "folded pose" motif where the quarry has forelegs folded under, head twisted back, as if crumpled by the onslaught of the predator, 49, 315, 320. Helene Kantor in her excellent summary of these features outlines what she terms the "Aegean Animal Style" and concludes that the "folded poses" motif did not transfer east as did the Flying Gallop.<sup>8</sup>
440. Three Sided Prism from Rutsi - LHI.  
Lion couchant regardant.  
The lion is used heraldically<sup>9</sup> here but is in the Flying Gallop in 384. Other Mycenaean heraldic lions are 19, 46, 50B (spotted), 60, 274A.  
The lion is an attendant to a Master or Mistress of Animals in the Minoan examples 74, 349 and the Mycenaean examples 36, 71, 72, 81, 87, 88, 89.

Examples 441 to 446 show the depiction of cattle in the three areas.

441. Cylinder Seal - Early Sumerian.  
Bulls and Ears of Grain.  
The sensitive rendering of animal form which is a feature of Mesopotamian tradition.  
Other early Mesopotamian uses include the link with lions in Contest Scenes mentioned above under 436, and in human attitudes 5. Its continuing use in ritual

---

6. FRANK AA p. 57. At first at temple entrances.  
7. The lion is depicted in LMI, II, and IIIA and B seal designs, CMS XII 207, 208, 229, 273, 286. The lion in attack is seen on the LMI seal CMS XII 213, and the LMII seal CMS XII 251.  
8. KANTOR (1947a) pp. 92-9. On the Folded Poses p. 92, "Falling or collapsing animals were shown in peculiar twisted positions. Resting or wounded beasts were drawn in compressed crouching poses with heads turned back. Such 'folded' postures often seem to be conditioned by the narrow compass of the available space ... but this cannot be the sole explanation for their frequency. They must be considered typical features of this style."  
9. See above p. 15.

with various deities is seen in 33, 331B, 347, 459, and the Cypriot examples 78, 326, 334B, 367 show a mixture of traditions.

442. Wall Painting, Saqqara - Dyn. V.  
Cattle.

The characteristic Egyptian rendering of animal pose sets four feet firmly on the ground, and the convention for rendering spotted hides shows dark blotches like "four-leaved clovers".<sup>10</sup> Hides at Pylos show similar markings.<sup>11</sup> The huge reliefs of Ramesses III hunting wild bulls should also be mentioned<sup>12</sup> and compared to the Aegean folded poses already discussed under 439.

443. Restoration of Relief, Knossos - Neo-Palatial.  
Charging Bull.

The Minoan delight in spirited poses is seen here. This particular means of depicting the full in the Flying Gallop may be the prototype of later "bull with lowered horns" motifs which are considerably more static.<sup>13</sup> There are also Mycenaean examples of Bull Sports 274B, 319, 363, 365.

444. Sealing from Pylos - LHIIIB.

Two Bulls in the Flying Gallop.

The interest in active poses continues down to the end of the Mycenaean period. The heraldic use of the bull is also long-lived in Mycenaean art 20, 21, 29, 41, 181, 183, as is its use as an attendant to Master and Mistress of Animals 67B, 147, and in ritual 434.

445. Pottery Designs - LHIIIB.

Bull.

Furumark's Motive 3 Bull.<sup>14</sup>

446. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII-III.

Cow suckling Calf.

This pose shows the artist's close observation of nature. The cow with head turned back to lick her suckling calf is a regular subject in Egyptian painting and reliefs.<sup>15</sup> Another fine Mycenaean example of the motif is the signet 59.

Examples 447 to 452 show the depiction of other animals.

10. See also MICH 20, 46, 105, 110.

11. PNII 15, 16, 18 D46. Lang, p. 33, terms them "trefoil blobs, blob-clusters".

12. MICH 553.

13. See above p. 125.

14. KARAGEORGHIS (1956) discusses two more examples.

15. SMITH OK p. 170 "The position of the suckling young animals ... was to become one of the most popular *motifs* in Old Kingdom art." BUCHANAN (1954) gives a short summary of the motif's use.

447. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
 Asiatics Bringing Horses as Tribute.  
 The horses are shown in the Egyptian convention for overlapping figures. Horses are not often shown apart from the chariot scenes. Native Egyptian fauna was a great source of inspiration for Egyptian artists who rendered it very sensitively if statically (the exceptions have been noted in the Flying Gallop motif 321, 322) especially the animal life in the marshes 421.
448. Animal Heads on a Syrian Vase - 13th C.  
 This piece of tribute depicted in a Ramesside tomb shows the Syrian tradition of adapting animal heads to form decorative designs especially in metalwork. The ibex is particularly favoured as seen in the Ugarit example 401 which also shows a Bull's Head rhyton, a link with the rhytons of the Aegean world. The ibex (goat) of Mesopotamian and Syrian tradition is depicted in 3, 47, 48A, 151, 152A, 154B, 277A. Similarly sheep are seen in 1, 31, 34, 209. Cypriot examples of both include 54, 69B, 70A, B, 85B, 86A, 271, 279, 280, 326.
449. Three Sided Prism from Mallia - MMIII.  
 Agrimi and other designs.  
 This is one of the earliest depictions of the native Cretan wild goat. Another is 310 and a winged agrimi is shown in 68B.  
 Mycenaean examples of a goat include the LHII-III seals 75, 164, and the LHIII seals 165 and 166.
450. Fresco from Thera - LMIA.  
 Stags in the Flying Gallop.  
 These stags are being chased by a great lion in another of the spirited Aegean animal compositions. Mycenaean examples are 50C, 176, 316.
451. Stone Relief from Alaca Huyuk - Hittite Empire.  
 Hittite God Mounted on a Stag.  
 Stags are also seen on Mitannian seals as in 154A and B.
452. Pottery Designs - LHIIIA and IIIB.  
 Stag and Goat.  
 Furumark's Motives 5 Stag and 6 Goat.  
 Mycenaean art also uses the sheep 57, 79, 80 and the boar 318, 354, 359.

Before leaving the discussion of animals it would be as well to look at the allied symbols, the Bucranium and the Bull's Head. The former is the skull with horns attached or any stylized rendering of this; the latter is the lifelike head of the bull with eyes and skin still there.

453. Pottery Designs from Arpachiya - 5th-4th Millennium.  
 Bucrania.  
 From the earliest times the Bucranium has been known in Mesopotamian art.



454. Wall Painting, Nuzi - 1450-1360.  
Bull's Head and Hator Head and other designs.  
Nuzi wall paintings of the 14th century show an Egyptian addition to the repertoire of motifs.  
Compare the Bulls' Heads on the Egyptian ceiling 218.
455. Three Sided Prism - EMIII.  
Bucranium and other designs.  
This seal from Crete shows the early establishment of the Bucranium motif there.
456. Glandular Seal from Mesara - LMIB.  
Two Bucrania opposed.  
The motif is finely worked. It is often associated with the double axe in Minoan art as is the Bull's Head.
457. Signet Ring from Mycenae - LHII.  
Bulls' Heads and Lions' Heads.  
The use of Bulls' Heads and Lions' Heads as rhytons may be signified here, or perhaps masks.
458. Pottery Designs - LHIIIB.  
Bucrania.  
Furumark's Motive 4 Bucranium.  
Other examples include the box 176 and the Cypriot seal 325.

In the common usage of lion, bull, goat, and Bucrania there are some points of correspondence in iconographical detail. The use of lion as Sphinx and Griffin, the use of lion, bull and goat as heraldic beasts or attendants to Master or Mistress figures, and the use of the Flying Gallop have all been discussed in their various sections. Additional details include the two cattle conventions of Egypt, the suckling cow and the "clover" spotted hide, which are also found in Aegean art and the use of lions and scorpions in Pre-Palatial Cretan glyptic which suggests Mesopotamian prototypes.<sup>16</sup> Another detail is the use of Aegean type Bull's Heads in Egyptian ceiling paintings and perhaps at Nuzi too. The motif of the "bull with lowered horn" and the use of finely wrought animal head rhytons is common to Aegean and Syrian art. Cyprus appears in a most curious position with a mixture of animal traditions in her art, free spirited Aegean poses,

---

16. AMIET p. 133. The scorpion does not continue in Minoan art though it is part of the Cretan fauna.

and ritual associations of the Mesopotamian kind. Finally two points on the fauna need comment. Firstly no one considers elephants as subjects suitable for art in spite of their production of ivory and their familiarity to all for they were still thriving in Syria at the time. Secondly in the Aegean the lion is a most important motif. The lion, bull, and goat are the animals most often depicted but the lion is a special favourite for the Mycenaeans whether portrayed as the heraldic beast or the violent aggressor. By contrast the lion is little portrayed in Minoan art.<sup>17</sup> There are only a few examples of it on early seals or later in a symbolic role as when attendant to a Mistress figure. Does this reflect the fact that lions still roamed Greece and the Mycenaeans had met their ferocity first hand? The European lion is supposed to have lived into historical times and so perhaps was in Mycenaean Greece. One would welcome external evidence to decide this point which is an important one for Mycenaean art since the lion is such a popular subject.

---

17. BOARDMAN (1970) pp. 58-9 discusses the lion in Aegean art. See also MYLONAS (1970) who argues that the lion was known in Mycenaean Greece.

### Ships

Ships, or at least boats, are depicted in all the artistic traditions from the third millennium.

- 459. Cylinder Seal from Uruk - Early Sumerian.  
Ritual Scene in a Boat.  
This is the simple reed boat of the Euphrates.  
Amiet also points out the use in early glyptic of a "God-Boat" where the prow becomes a god paddling the boat along.<sup>1</sup>
- 460. Wall Painting, Saqqara - Dyn. V.  
Nautical Tournament, Mastaba of Ptah-hotep.  
These are the simple skiffs of the Old Kingdom.  
By New Kingdom times boats were larger and more elaborate, often with a central cabin covered with splendid tapestry.<sup>2</sup> Their use as funerary barges is well attested. The boating scenes fit conveniently into the Egyptian register system of composition.
- 461. Three Sided Prism - MMIIA.  
Ship with a Mast and Halyards.  
An earlier Pre-Palatial seal also shows a ship with a mast and an ECII "frying-pan" shows a ship with oars.
- 461B. Lentoid Seal - LMIB.  
Ship with a mast, sail and oars.
- 462. Miniature Fresco from Thera - LMIA.  
Grand Ship of the Thera Fleet.  
This newly discovered fresco shows a whole fleet of ships and boats of various types and sizes, providing the most detailed information to date on Aegean Bronze Age shipping.<sup>3</sup> The scene is handled in the Aegean Mountain View Perspective.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. AMIET pp. 177-81.

2. MICH 114 (in colour), 349, 411, 428.

3. For a summary of Mycenaean shipping, at least a Pre-Theran summary, see MORRISON (1968) pp. 7-11. An earlier summary MARINATOS (1933) is still useful for it provides illustrations of 69 ships and compares them with other vessels depicted in eastern art. COHEN (1938) discounts the use of the ram in the Minoan period. LAVIOSA (1969-70) also discusses Bronze Age shipping with particular attention to the type of ship used by the Peoples of the Sea in the battle against Ramesses III. See below p. 155.

4. The term coined above p. 142 is an attempt to describe the organization of elements of many of the scenes in large scale Aegean compositions. The scene is treated as if it is a panorama spread out before someone who is seated at a vantage point quite high, a mountain crag or sea side cliff.

- 463. Tomb Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
 Syrian Ships in a Tomb Painting.  
 The shipping composition is managed in the register system. With Syrian ships the shape of prow and stern is almost identical.<sup>5</sup>
- 464. Wall Relief - Dyn. XX.  
 Battle of Ramesses III with the People of the Sea.  
 The importance of the event is marked by the effort spent by Ramesses III in recording it at Medinet Habu. This scene is unique in Egyptian temple art.<sup>6</sup>
- 465A. Sherd from Iolkos - MH.  
 Ship(?)
- 465B. Stone Stele from Hyria - LHI(?)<sup>7</sup>  
 Ships.
- 466A. Signet Ring from Tiryns - Undated.  
 Ship beached at a Port.  
 The ship and the scene are very like the Theran fresco, 462.
- 466B. Pottery Design - LHIIIB.  
 Ship.  
 Furumark's Motive 40 Ship.

During the Bronze Age, both the Aegean and the East use the ship in their art with each tradition rendering its own specific details of shape, mast, sails, rigging, oars. When Egyptian artists portray foreign ships they appear to make a real effort to render their characteristic details. Neither the Syrians nor the Hittites ever develop a pictorial tradition of shipping though both are known to use the sea.<sup>8</sup> Even more surprising is to realise how few of their ships the Aegeans depicted in their art in spite of their far-flung trade.<sup>9</sup> Prior to the discovery of the Theran Ship Fresco there were probably less than twenty depictions of Minoan and Mycenaean ships on small-scale pieces like seals and pottery for they are quite absent from the grand palace frescoes of Crete and the Mainland.

- 
- 5. SAVE-SODERBERGH (1946) pp. 56-9 discusses these ships but the whole book is informative on eastern shipping in the time of Dynasty XVIII.
  - 6. NELSON (1943) p. 40. Nelson's discussion of the artistic achievement in this portrayal is most discerning. For our interest in the ships, his Fig. 4 the scene with floating bodies removed, is most informative.
  - 7. For a discussion on the stele see BLEGEN (1949) pp. 39-42.
  - 8. Above 463 and CULICAN (1966) pp. 42-6 for Syrian Shipping, GOETZE (1975c) pp. 263-6 for Hittite naval exploits c1200.
  - 9. For trade with the S.E. Mediterranean see STUBBINGS (1951a) especially maps 1, 2, 3 and more recently HANKEY (1970). For trade with Italy and Sicily a summary is given in VERM pp. 114-5, 152.

## Part II The Artistic Issues

### 5 THE QUESTION OF ARTISTIC EXCHANGE

#### Indigenous Creation and Motif Transference

The iconographical analysis of motifs undertaken in *Part I* has revealed evidence of great variation in the degree of correspondence of iconographical detail of motifs used in common by the artistic traditions of the Aegean and the East. All this evidence will need to be taken into account in attempting to come to a conclusion as to whether this common usage can be attributed to indigenous creation in each separate area or whether it is due to exchange between the artistic traditions.

Indigenous creation can be the only explanation for common usage when the motifs are found in areas so far apart geographically that contact is inadmissible or when they belong to artistic traditions so far distant in time that no connection could be envisaged. Neither of these two cases is applicable to the Aegean and the Near East in the Bronze Age. The trade and invasion routes across the ancient world were well-used and of great antiquity. A journey from Babylon to Mycenae is a considerable undertaking but would not have been impossible in the Bronze Age. Alexander the Great managed more than the reverse journey with no real improvement in communications a millennium later. The distribution of Melian obsidian indicates that ancient craft were adequate for Neolithic times while the Theran Ship Fresco and the Medinet Habu reliefs show that large scale maritime expeditions were possible in the Late Bronze Age.<sup>1</sup> The interval of time from Early

---

1. For further discussion on Bronze Age trade and communications see below Chapter 8.

Dynastic art in Mesopotamia to the productions of the Mycenaean palaces is vast but not such that it cannot be spanned by conservative artistic traditions.<sup>2</sup> When determining the reasons for the common usage of motifs in the Aegean and the East in the Bronze Age it is necessary then to consider for each motif, the two possibilities, indigenous creation of motifs in each separate area or the transference of motifs between artistic traditions. In deciding between these two possibilities the nature of the motifs themselves will give some guide. Indigenous creation may well be the answer where the motif comprises the depiction of common flora or fauna or some piece of everyday equipment, where it is a simple pattern, or where a theme of universal interest to man is represented, even though there may be artistic traditions close by which are using or have used the motif earlier. Indigenous creation is unlikely to provide an explanation for the common usage of those motifs which comprise highly specialized subject matter. In both cases however it must be the precise observable detail of the iconography of the motif that decides for or against transference.

The group of motifs common to the Aegean and the East which comprise highly specialized subject matter are the Master of Animals, Mistress of Animals, Sphinx, Griffin, Dragons and Crocodiles, Thouris, and the Minoan Genius, two particular variants of the Sacred Tree motif, four elaborate Spiral designs, and the Flying Gallop. The co-incidence of iconographical detail revealed by the analysis of the examples and summarised at the end of each motif discussion in *Part I* argues strongly for the transference to the Aegean of six eastern motifs; the Master of Animals, Mistress of Animals, and that variant

---

2. The conservative nature of ancient art and the longevity of motifs was discussed above in the *Introduction*, pp. 2-4.

of the Sacred Tree motif, the Animals at the Tree of Life from the Mesopotamian and derivative traditions, the Griffin from Mitannian art, and the Sphinx and Thueris from the Egyptian tradition.<sup>3</sup> Indeed the coincidence of iconographical detail is such that motif transference can be the only acceptable explanation. Co-incidence in iconographical detail further argues the transference of two Aegean motifs to the East; the Spiral with the elaborate interlocking designs and the Flying Gallop.<sup>4</sup> However, before these two transferences can be accepted, there are some additional points to consider.

The Spiral motifs which appear in different artistic traditions in widely separated areas in the third millennium may be the result of independent invention, perhaps influenced by metal working techniques.<sup>5</sup> However the four elaborate spiraliiform designs investigated in Chapter 2 show such intricacies of design that the question of transference of their iconography from the Aegean to the East must seriously be considered.<sup>6</sup> So far as Egypt is concerned, Ward, in the most recent treatment of the matter, argues that the involved spiraliiform designs of the Middle Kingdom which use all four variations of the motif are more than probably the result of the local development of the earlier simple Spirals of the Old Kingdom.<sup>7</sup> Ward has meticulously traced the iconographical detail of Old Kingdom plant forms which have basic Spiral elements but his suggestion that the

---

3. See the discussions of each motif in *Part I* for the iconographical details.

4. Many of these transferences have already been proposed. The Master and Mistress of Animals TAMVAKI (1974), the Sphinx DESSENNE (1957a), Thueris EVANS PMI pp. 199-200, PMIV pp. 430-67, and GILL (1964) and (1970), the Flying Gallop EVANS PMI pp. 713-21.

5. Below Chapter 8.

6. For the detail, above pp. 100-6.

7. WARD (1971), "The Origin of Egyptian Spiraliiform Decoration", pp. 104-18.

advance into elaborate spiraliform designs was prompted by the need to fit the design to the limited oval base of the scarab does not seem to account for all the iconographical issues. There is nothing in the overwhelmingly static nature of Egyptian design that would prompt this advance whatever the shape to be decorated. However, influence from the Aegean with its already highly developed interlocking Spiral motifs could provide the impetus towards the torsional and rapport spiraliform designs on the scarabs and elsewhere. The importance of the interweaving character and torsional swirl of these new designs was the point stressed earlier by Smith when discussing Aegean influence on Middle Kingdom composition.<sup>8</sup> This is the iconographical argument that must turn Ward's reluctant allowance of the possibility of Minoan or Cycladic influence on Egyptian tradition on Dynasty XI into a more positive proposal of transference. When considering the increase in spiraliform designs in New Kingdom Egypt it cannot be clearly established whether this occurs because of the renewed Aegean contact or because of indigenous development from Middle Kingdom prototypes. The answer may be to accept both proposals since they are not mutually contradictory and since the idea of renewed contacts strengthening already established designs would go a long way to explaining the great popularity of these motifs in Egypt at this period. As for the examples of interlocking spiraliform designs in Asia in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages it would similarly seem reasonable to argue impetus from the Aegean rather than development from the sporadic examples of simple spiral designs of the third millennium, particularly when the examples of the Running Spiral as border is one of the regular Aegean usages.

---

8. SMITH AA pp. 117-8.

KANTOR (1947a) pp. 2-5 also suggested Aegean influence. New evidence would help confirm her position though date any exchange earlier, WARD (1971) pp. 116-8.



The Flying Gallop must also be considered as one of the motifs with specialized subject matter, for while it seems to us to be the obvious way of depicting animals moving fast, it did not necessarily seem so to the artists of the ancient world.<sup>8</sup> In the early formative stages of both the Mesopotamian and Egyptian artistic traditions the artists chose static animal poses and these static poses remained the standard for these arts and the derivative traditions until well into the second millennium. Minoan art however did have this eidetic view of the animal kingdom's propensity for swift movement and violent action.<sup>9</sup> It is possible that the Syrian and Egyptian artists of the Late Bronze Age did independently develop a Flying Gallop motif in spite of the earlier strict adherence to static animal poses but it does seem more probable that the motif transferred from the Aegean to the East.

With the Dragon and Crocodile motifs and with that other variant of the Sacred Tree motif, the Tree-watering Ritual, the iconographical details observed in the relatively few extant Aegean examples show a lower level of correspondence with eastern forms.<sup>10</sup> The Minoan Dragon and the Minoan Crocodile may be derivatives of the Snake Dragon of Mesopotamia and the Egyptian crocodile respectively, and the Aegean Tree-watering Ritual may have antecedents in the Sacred

---

8. Above p. 107.

9. BOARDMAN (1970a) p. 32 in discussing the first animal studies on Minoan seals speaks of "grace and movement untrammelled by any of the set iconographic conventions which bound the animal studies of Near Eastern and Egyptian artists".

10. For the details above pp. 55-8, 65-71.

Tree and Flowing Vase motifs of the Mesopotamian tradition. On the present evidence motif transference does seem the most likely explanation for the unusual features.<sup>11</sup>

Since it was shown in Chapter 2 that the Sacred Pillar regularly uses the same iconographical formulas as the Sacred Tree,<sup>12</sup> the question arises whether the Sacred Pillar receives its iconographical details from the Sacred Tree repertoire by simple substitution, or whether it was independently derived from some pillar form of the Near East or Egypt. Evans would have the latter<sup>13</sup> but none of his explanations have enough precise iconographical detail to prove convincing. The main eastern contenders for this role must be the obelisk pillars of Egypt (seen again in the Obelisk Temple at Byblos), the Pillar of Heaven of Mitannian art, and Syrian baetyls. However the first is a distinctive shape and cannot be thought to be round or to support a capital and the second, though round, supports the Winged Sun Disk and there is never any suggestion that it can be the structural member of a house or palace. The third has insufficient evidence for its use in the figurative arts. Because of the discrepancies in the iconography and the lack of Syrian evidence it would seem the wisest course to reject the theory of outside inspiration for the Minoan-Mycenaean Sacred Pillar and consider it an Aegean creation which fits conveniently into the iconographical formulae developed for the Sacred Tree.

There are three other motifs which could claim to be discussed with this group of highly specialized motifs, Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Group and Mirror Reverse. It is true that they are not similar to the others of the group just discussed since they are not

---

11. LEVI (1945) and GILL (1963) accept the transfer of the iconography. See also below p. 252.

12. Above pp. 70-1.

13. EVANS (1901) p. 48.

motifs of subject matter but motifs of method. They are in fact principles of design which guide the organization of material and as such could be independently discovered in each area. However the precision of their iconography favours transference as the explanation of their common usage in the Aegean and the East.<sup>14</sup> The details arguing transference are different for each motif. The Antithetical Group is an integral part of the iconography of three of the motifs of specialist subject matter, the Master of Animals, Mistress of Animals, and the Animals at the Tree of Life, and two other specialist motifs, the Sphinx and Griffin, often form part of the Antithetical Group as attendant animals. The Heraldic Poses which show such widespread use in the Aegean and the East in the Late Bronze Age are the ones regularly used for the Sphinx and Griffin and the other attendant animals in the Antithetical Group motifs. In view of the intimate connections between these iconographical details the only proper course open is to recognize the intrinsic unity of the motif and not try to separate out the Antithetical group and the Heraldic Poses as motifs of method which may have been independently discovered. The Mirror Reverse is in a rather different category since, in the Aegean examples, it is not associated with any specifically eastern subject matter,<sup>15</sup> though the Lions, Sphinxes and Griffins which are paired in the Mirror Reverse in Syrian glyptic do find a home in Aegean art. However the Mirror Reverse is a very unusual method of employing the principle of antithesis in artistic design and its exceptional nature would argue for transference and against independent invention. While the precision of the iconography must propose transference, it should be remembered that there are relatively few examples of this motif in Aegean art.

---

14. For the details, above pp. 15-22, 23-6, 27-9.

15. Some reasons for the non-transference of specifically Egyptian subject matter are suggested in Chapter 9.

The other group of motifs, those which depict ordinary subject matter or are concerned with themes of universal interest to man, are more likely to be the spontaneous creation of artists in each area. These are the remaining motifs of Chapter 2 and the general themes and artistic conventions of Chapter 4, but even here, there are some cases where the iconographical detail is so close it would argue some artistic transference between the traditions.

The Palm and Papyrus at first seem to be motifs of specialized subject matter and to belong to the first group, but, since it is possible that they both grew in the Aegean in the Bronze Age<sup>16</sup> it seems more circumspect to discuss them in this group, which includes flora common to Aegean and eastern lands. The iconography of the Palm motif comprises stylized and symmetrical depictions in the Aegean and the East, with details like tri-partite Palm trees and curled lower fronds almost identical on some Syrian and Aegean examples.<sup>17</sup> With the Papyrus motif, many Minoan and Mycenaean examples reflect the natural reed form and are thus close to the Egyptian depictions; others stylize the flower to create decorative forms which are close to Syrian variants of the Papyrus motifs.<sup>18</sup> With the Rosette motif the parallels in iconographical detail of Double Rosettes, Rosette Borders, and Rosette-studded spiraliform designs in the Aegean and the East<sup>19</sup> may best be explained by a transference of the Aegean usages to the eastern artistic traditions.

---

16. Above p. 73.

17. Above pp. 72-5.

18. Above pp. 76-83.

19. Above pp. 83-8.

With the simple Guilloche and the Linked Circles motif two points in favour of transference should be noted;<sup>20</sup> that some of the examples may have been influenced by the Running Spiral designs<sup>21</sup> which probably did transfer, and that the Linked Circles patterns have close correspondence in their iconographical elements and in the variations in compositions.<sup>22</sup>

As far as the two-dimensional representations of the Human Figure are concerned it would seem a very superficial assessment to attribute Aegean conventions to Egyptian inspiration as has sometimes been done.<sup>23</sup> The idea of large wall compositions, even some of the subject matter, may be Egyptian inspired, but not the detailed rendition of the body. If prototypes are demanded then the iconographical detail points to the Mesopotamian tradition since all the elements of the Minoan forms are there, only needing slight modifications to cope with the difficulties of Minoan costume.<sup>24</sup> However it is not really necessary to search for prototypes. Had the Egyptian canon appeared in all the other areas borrowing would have been the only explanation since the canon is so artificial a construction. However the profile and combination conventions shared by the Mesopotamian and Aegean traditions are just those which many arts develop in early stages and as such could therefore be indigenous developments in each area. The only examples that might be considered as exceptions to this general

---

20. For details, above pp. 95-9.

21. FURU p. 359.

22. TUFNELL and WARD (1966) pp. 184-5 in searching for parallels to the scarab designs in the Montet Jar suggest links with Anatolia, the Cyclades, and the Lerna sealings.

23. See Evans' discussion PMII pp. 719-57, PMIV pp. 879-81, which argues the Egyptian connection.

24. For Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Aegean details, above pp. 132-9.

principle of independent invention for the conventions of the human figure are the Woman Smelling a Flower, the profile breast in combination pose, and the gradation by size at Pylos, which could be developed from Egyptian conventions, and the almost frontal poses of many Aegean female figures which could follow Mesopotamian prototypes.

In the Border designs, there are some examples of the Barred Band and Checkerboard at the Malkata Palace which require an explanation, such as transference, for the Aegean details incorporated in them.<sup>25</sup>

In the War and Hunt scenes, and particularly in the Chariot scenes of the Late Bronze Age, there are some close correspondences in iconographical detail that suggest motif transferences. Helene Kantor has argued Aegean influence on Egyptian animal poses in the hunting scenes in early 18th Dynasty tomb paintings.<sup>26</sup> While many of the animal attacks in these scenes derive ultimately from formulas developed in the Old Kingdom,<sup>27</sup> there is a new liveliness in their rendition. This, together with the exploitation of the full repertoire of the Aegean Flying Gallop motif, argues strongly for an infusion of the Aegean interest in movement into the usually static Egyptian portrayals.<sup>28</sup> A similar metamorphosis is produced in the Cat Catching Wildfowl motif when it transfers from Egypt to the Aegean. There it is rendered with a new aggressiveness by the leaping poses and contorted

25. Above pp. 140-1.

26. KANTOR (1947a) pp. 62-71 "Aegean Influences in the Egyptian Animal Style" and particularly pp. 66-9 "The Hunting Scene of Puimre".

27. For the standard animal poses of Egyptian art see SMITH OK Fig. 92a "Hunting Scene in the chapel of Mereruka".

28. Details above pp. 108-10.

postures of the Aegean Animal Style.<sup>29</sup> The other experiment undertaken in Dynasty XVIII hunting scenes<sup>30</sup> was the abandonment of the horizontal register system for organizing the composition and with it the partial abandonment of feet in contact with the ground line which may be due to the influence of Aegean Mountain View perspective. These features and experiments in animal poses had repercussions in later New Kingdom art. Stevenson Smith considers that "the historical reliefs of Sety I, Ramesses II, and Ramesses III formed a logical conclusion to the experiments with movement and spatial relationships that originated in the hunting scenes of the first half of Dynasty XVIII".<sup>31</sup> Beside these two examples of possible Aegean influence on Egypt there is the earlier example of possible motif transference from Egypt to the Aegean in the siege scenes with the motif of the falling warrior. There is also the possibility that some of the more lively renditions of Cypriot and Syrian Chariot teams in the 14th and 13th centuries are due to the effect of the spirited Aegean chariot scenes with their horses in the Flying Gallop.<sup>32</sup>

Of the other general themes, co-incidence of iconographical detail argues only a few transferences. The Cattle Hide convention may have transferred from Egypt to the Aegean, while the Aegean Bull's Head could have transferred east to Egypt and to Nuzi along with the Bull with Lowered Horn which appears in Cyprus and Syria.<sup>33</sup> The absence of the lion from Crete would suggest that the lions on Pre-Palatial seals are artistic derivatives ultimately of eastern prototypes.

---

29. For aspects of the Aegean Animal Style see the discussions Flying Gallop pp. 107-12, Duel pp. 121-3, Hunt pp. 143-5, and Animal Conventions p. 149.

30. See the discussions KANTOR (1947) pp. 62-9, and SMITH IN pp. 137-68.

31. SMITH IN p. 155.

32. Details of Syrian, Cypriot, and Aegean scenes, above pp. 123, 125, 145.

33. Details above pp. 150, 125.

If the lion did roam Mycenaean Greece then the many lions in Mycenaean art could be explained as representation of local fauna.

If the lion was unknown then its depiction can only be explained as an artistic motif taken over in its entirety from eastern arts and the Mycenaean portrayal of the boar would take on a new significance as the indigenous ferocious wild beast worthy of hunting and fighting. In the present state of knowledge about lions in Greece and with the regular use of lions in Mycenaean art it must be allowed that the Mycenaeans knew the lion but also drew on the eastern traditions which had long used the lion in all manner of compositions.

For the motifs in Chapter 3 the question of transference arises only in exceptional cases. Either the motifs are widely used eastern motifs which are not found in any regular use in the Aegean, the Smiting Figure, the Star Disk in Crescent repertoire, the Winged Sun Disk and the Scale Mountain, or they are favourite Aegean motifs which have no regular use in the East, the Duel, Bull Sports, Fish, Dolphin, Octopus, Nautilus, the Tri-curved Arch, Rocky Landscape and Glen, Marbling and Colour Waves. The exceptional case of the Star Disk and Crescent appearing on Aegean signets above cult scenes, and the Scale Mountain used correctly on Minoan seals, would require transference of artistic motifs from the East to the Aegean to explain satisfactorily the coincidence in iconographical detail.<sup>34</sup> The few instances of the Duel motif found in the East, albeit very statically rendered, are best explained as Syrian copies of the Mycenaean motif and some of the eastern compositions of bulls running or bulls at bay do seem to be faint reflections of the Minoan Bull Sports. Where Cypriot seals carry marine motifs like the leaping Dolphin, they are best explained by motif transference.<sup>35</sup> The examples of the Rocky

---

34. Details above pp. 116-8.

35. Details above pp. 126-7.



Landscape in the Kenamun Tomb and the Marbling at Qatna and Mari could also have their Aegean iconography explained by motif transference.<sup>36</sup>

For all these proposed transferences there can be no incontrovertible proof. The test is the level of correspondence of iconographical detail and while some correspondences are clearly observable, others are harder to discern. With the first group of motifs there will be, or in some cases, has already been, wide acceptance of the argument for transference. With the subsidiary motifs of the second group there is room for doubt and some proposals may not be accepted. However the cumulative effect when they are considered together and along with the clearer cases of the first group, inclines one to accept rather more transferences than less, a point that will be taken up in the next chapter when the timing and avenue of the proposed transferences are discussed. At this stage of the investigation the evidence of the iconography supports the transference of all the motifs of the first group, the motifs of specialized subject matter. The evidence argues strongly for the transference of eleven of these, and only slightly less strongly, because of the lower degree of coincidence in iconographical detail, of three more. These fourteen transferences result in the regular usage of the motifs by the receiving traditions and so the motifs could be termed "migrating" rather than transferring motifs. For motifs in the second group, there is not such explicit iconographical evidence for transference but rather detail which suggests limited exchange of particular usages, or the transference of subsidiary motifs from large compositions. Often these do not produce a lasting effect on the adoptive tradition and so might be termed "sporadic" transferences. The third level of transference suggested by iconographical detail is in the area of large-scale compositions, and here one can speak only of "influences".

---

36. Details above pp. 130-1.

## 5 THE QUESTION OF ARTISTIC EXCHANGE

### The International Repertoire

The great care taken in this iconographical study to remain objective in defining motifs and describing their usage has not only allowed the tracing of motif transference but has highlighted a function of the motif, suspected at the outset of the investigation. It seems that the motif has an identity of its own and this enables it to be taken out of its parent tradition and adopted by another tradition which subsequently modifies the iconographical details to suit its own cultural needs. In this matter of separate identity and transferability the motif is rather like the standard epithet or repetitive phrase or oral poetry. In poems composed in the oral tradition, once a satisfactory way of rendering a theme or a description has been found, it is used over and over and it comes to possess an identity of its own which speaks out even when it is sometimes used inappropriately by the poet. Now there are also certain restrictions affecting the development of motif usage in ancient art. Ancient art does not value innovation for its own sake. The idiosyncratic choice of artists is closely controlled or even suppressed. The artistic canons are set early, in Egypt even more clearly than Mesopotamia, and these rules, sanctioned by religion and perpetuated by tradition, are rarely ever allowed to be transgressed. Perhaps in the freer world of Aegean art the artist could have more chance to experiment but very often he too chooses the time-honoured ways of doing things.<sup>1</sup> It should

---

1. The conservatism of ancient art including the longevity of motif was one of the factors that made it possible to undertake this investigation of motif usage. *Introduction*, pp. 2-4.

not then be surprising that these restrictions on the ancient artist produce set forms, codified designs, stylized arrangements just as the constraints on the oral poet result in standard epithets, repetitive phrases, not to mention thematic composition.

One result of the transference of motifs between artistic traditions throughout the Bronze Age and the longevity of the motif in its own artistic tradition is the establishment in Late Bronze Age of a repertoire of designs used in common by the artists of many cultures. It would seem appropriate to term this assemblage of motifs, an assemblage which includes almost all those investigated in Chapter 2 and some of those discussed in Chapter 4, the International Repertoire.<sup>2</sup> It is clear that Aegean art participates in the International Repertoire both by accepting exotic motifs into its own tradition and by contributing a few motifs like the elaborate Spiral designs and the Flying Gallop and some features of the Aegean Animal Style to the cosmopolitan assemblage of designs. When one considers both the number of motifs accepted from the East and the extent to which some of them such as the Sphinx, Griffin, Thouris, Antithetical Groups and Heraldic Poses, become embedded in Minoan and Mycenaean art, there is a good case to be made for viewing Aegean art as an heir to the eastern traditions. This is not to suggest that Aegean Art has no definable characteristic of its own and is simply a pale reflection of the eastern traditions. On the contrary, this enquiry, from the outset, has insisted upon the strikingly individual nature of Aegean art, indeed of the special and definable nature of each tradition, as

---

2. The composite foliate patterns of the eastern traditions can also be included in the International Repertoire. They were not discussed in Chapter 3 because they are of a relatively late creation compared with the other motifs in that Chapter. They are treated in the discussion on the International Styles, Chapter 7.

being the very thing which makes possible such a detailed investigation of transference of motifs between traditions. Most certainly Aegean art has a distinct identity of its own but it should always be considered against the whole backdrop of the older established eastern artistic traditions. Only then will its true nature be revealed as an interesting compound of indigenous Aegean forms and inherited eastern motifs, all further transmuted by continuing participation in the internationalism in art in the Late Bronze Age.

The timing and avenue of the motif transferences which culminate in the internationalism of Late Bronze Age art are most difficult to establish. The iconographical evidence of *Part I* would suggest three phases of motif transference between the Aegean and the East corresponding to the Cretan Pre-Palatial, Old Palace, and New Palace Periods. However before the Aegean could accept motifs from the East, several phases of motif transference had had to occur there. The early movements of Mesopotamian motifs into the Syrian area can be traced in the glyptic designs. Syrian cylinder seal styles and peripheral styles in general always kept in step with each development in Mesopotamian glyptic.<sup>3</sup> Pierre Amiet traces the transference of motifs to Syria during the Early Dynastic Period<sup>4</sup> and though the discussion in Chapter 2 has concentrated on the Mesopotamian motifs of the Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Group, the Contest Scene repertoire, Rosette, Quatrefoil and Guilloche,<sup>5</sup> these must be recognized as

---

3. FRANK CS pp. 224-5. The only significant exception to this reliance on Mesopotamian creativity comes in the middle of the second millennium, the time of the Mitannian incursions.

4. AMIET p. 65, Pl. 85 Bis.

5. Additional examples from Syrian glyptic down to 2000 are listed below.  
Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Group and Contest Scene repertoire:  
BUCH 721, 777, 784A, 786, 790, AMIET Pl. 85 Bis J, K, N, O, P.  
Rosette: BUCH 776.  
Quatrefoil: BUCH 723, 724, 740, 760.

comprising only part of the subject matter migrating from Mesopotamia west. Other motifs most frequently used are scorpions, lions, bulls, goats, and the Banquet scene.<sup>6</sup> Of the many areas supplying examples of the transference two should be noted, Brak<sup>7</sup> in Northern Mesopotamia and Tell Judaideh in North Syria.<sup>8</sup> Somewhat later in Syria, contemporaneous with the Neo-Sumerian and early Old Babylonian periods, a particular Provincial Style of glyptic can be recognized which gives further examples of transference,<sup>9</sup> and a sealing from Alalakh shows the Guilloche which is well-used in Syrian seals at the beginning of the second millennium.<sup>10</sup>

In the Pre-Palatial Period seal, pottery and jewellery designs give the first examples of the Rosette, Quatrefoil, Lion, Scorpion, and elaborate Spiral motifs<sup>11</sup> and at the end of EHII the sealings from

- 
6. Scorpions: BUCH 705, 706, 721, 776, 784, 790.  
 Lions: BUCH 759, 760, 767, 773, 784, 789, 790.  
 Bulls: BUCH 771; AMIET Pl. 85 Bis C, J, K, N, P.  
 Goats: BUCH 712, 713, 728, 760, 767, 789, 792; AMIET Pl. 85 Bis A.  
 Banquet Scene: BUCH 775, 816.  
 Three seals of special comment. BUCH 721 appears to show a Syrian version of AMIET's "dompteur de serpents", see above p. 41.  
 BUCH 725 shows an interesting Spiral ornament also found on AMIET Pl. 85 Bis E.
  7. The Sealings from Brak of the Early Dynastic Period cover the full repertoire and give extremely good examples of the Mesopotamian motifs listed in Chapter 2. See BUCH 751-8, 761-5, 769, 779-83, 785, 787-8, 792, 794-815.
  8. BRAIDWOOD (1960). Phase A begins c5000, p. 504, and Phase J ends c2000, p. 523. Stamp seals are known from Phase A but the cylinder seal only appears in Phase G, p. 331. Spiraliform designs appear on seals and pottery, Figs. 215, 253, 324 and Pl. 27. Quatrefoil motifs appear on seals, Figs. 254, 380. Note also the "double-axe" bead of Phase A, p. 62, and the six figurines of Phase G, Figs. 240-5.
  9. BUCH 835-54. The seal BUCH 849 causes some concern since it would show at this early stage two well developed Griffins. Buchanan does compare it with later seals, p. 164, where perhaps it should be placed. It is not archaeologically dated.
  10. ALAL p. 259 Pl. LX 7.
  11. Above pp. 84, 89, 148, 101. The Pre-Palatial seals from the tholos at Marathokephalo are dated EMII to MMIIb and four seals use Lion and Scorpion motifs, CMSII.1 222, 223, 224, 225. Other examples fall in the EMII-MMII range.

Lerna show the use of the Rosette, Quatrefoil and the elaborate Spiral motifs.<sup>12</sup> The Rosette, Quatrefoil, Lion and Scorpion motifs are firmly established in Early Dynastic glyptic and if the Minoan motifs are derivatives of the Mesopotamian ones then the avenue of transference could be through Syria, where, at places like Tell Judaideh and Byblos, seals of a derivative Syrian style carry the motifs. If the appearance of the elaborate Spiral motifs in Egypt is the result of transference, then it could also be transference through Syria. The Montet Jar provides evidence of a cosmopolitan collection of designs including Spirals, Linked Circles, Goats, Monkeys, Egyptian hieroglyphics, and stylized Papyrus and Lotus elements.<sup>13</sup> It should be remembered that the only motifs where iconographical detail can argue their transference are the Lion and the elaborate Spiral designs, and that in EM III and MM I the innovative spirit of Crete was quite equal to creating new seal designs. Nevertheless if two special motifs were transferred others may also have been.

The next main period, corresponding to the Old Palace Period in Crete, shows considerable motif transference, with perhaps the century c1850 to 1750 the most important. In Syria there is the formation of a local Syrian glyptic style<sup>14</sup> with close affinities to the Old Babylonian seals and the Mari frescoes. Heraldic Poses

---

12. Above p. 101, following MEATH (1958) pp. 116-20 where these have been taken as Helladic designs not necessarily reliant on Minoan designs.

13. TUFNELL and WARD (1966).

14. The Early and Mature Old Syrian Style is dated c1850 to c early 17th century. BUCH pp. 165-8. See also PORADA (1948a) p. 118, and PORADA (1957) p. 196 where she proposes that the time before Hammurabi is the time of most intensive Babylonian influence on Syrian glyptic.

continue to be used for animals with a predilection for couchant and sejant, the complicated designs of the Contest Scene repertoire have mostly disappeared, but the Winged Ishtar repertoire has arrived. The Antithetical Group, Rosette and Guilloche become regular motifs along with the Introduction Scene, examples of the Star Disk in Crescent group, and the Nude Goddess.<sup>15</sup> Another characteristic of this eclectic Old Syrian Style is the number of foreign features found in it, the Egyptian being the next major component after the Mesopotamian. Here Buchanan lists the Sphinx, ankh, vulture god, goddess, Hathor head, child, and ornamental tree.<sup>16</sup> The same examples show the acceptance of the Mirror Reverse, Palm, Palmette. Other influences observable in Old Syrian glyptic are the Hittite and the Minoan which Buchanan sees in the depiction of Hittite headdresses and Minoan male figures.<sup>17</sup> Other evidence for the transference of Egyptian motifs to Syria at this time is provided by small finds from Byblos. These are figurines representing Thoueris and ivory plaques showing papyrus flowers in clumps and with the fan curled down into volutes. These latter designs are to be compared with the papyrus flowers on the artificial tree in the Investiture Fresco at Mari.<sup>18</sup> At this time Crete produces the first examples of the Minoan Genius and the Tree-watering Ritual motifs and makes full use of the Palm, Palmette, Papyrus and Scale Pattern as seen in Kamares designs. The Rosette continues to be used, the Quatrefoil less so, and the Guilloche may be used

---

15. BUCH 855, 857, 876, 880-2, 886-7.  
ALAL Pl. LX 8-14, Pl. LXI 15-19, 21.

16. BUCH p. 166 and BUCH 867, 871, 874, 883, 885.  
BUCH 874, "ornamental tree" is my Palmette Tree 174B.

17. BUCH p. 166 and 878, 859, 971, 889, 890, 892-5.

18. The subject of Middle Kingdom influence at Byblos has been treated generally by HANSEN (1969) and SMITH (1969).

until MMII.<sup>19</sup> In Egypt there is continued use of the interlocking spiraliform patterns in 12th Dynasty designs, even in Upper Egypt.<sup>20</sup> Elaborate Spiral motifs are also now seen on Syrian seals,<sup>21</sup> Metalwork, as well as the Mari frescoes. The Mari Palace also gives other examples of Minoan motifs in the Marbling and "Flame" patterns on the throne podium.<sup>22</sup> The wide usage of the motifs in the Aegean and the East at this time may represent the continuance of indigenous traditions rather than the consolidation of earlier transferences. However some new transferences are indicated by examples from Syria and Mari. These, and the usage of established motifs suggest again a special role for Syria. Its art shows all the Mesopotamian and Egyptian motifs and it accepts some of the elaborate Spiral motifs from the Aegean. The iconography seems to argue direct Aegean influence on Syria, perhaps via Alalakh, rather than a further dispersal from Egypt because the Spirals at Mari are accompanied by other Aegean motifs not regularly used in Middle Kingdom Egypt.

The next period, corresponding to the New Palace Period in Crete,<sup>23</sup> is a crucial one for motif transference with the century c1600 to c1500 being the most important for the Aegean. In the East this is the period in glyptic designs of the Mitannian Style and the sudden appearance in the 16th century of the cylinder seal in Cyprus.<sup>24</sup>

---

19. Details above p. 98. The seals carrying Guilloche motifs are dated EMII-MMII.

20. The many examples at Kerma that appear to have Aegean affinities pose the question of perhaps some route to the Nile through Libya and the oases to the Nile. There is at present no evidence for contact between the Aegean and Libya in the Bronze Age, BOARDMAN (1968).

21. Attempted in 292A but a better example is ALAL Pl. LXII, where four rows of Running Spiral are well handled.

22. SMITH IN Figs. 127, 128, 129 and C and illustration 289.

23. The period till the end of LMII. The last phase LMIIIA<sub>1</sub> is included in the next section.

24. PORADA (1948b).



Mitannian glyptic<sup>25</sup> draws on both the Old Syrian and Old Babylonian repertoires and favours the subjects of Griffins, humans, winged figures, Master of Animals, lions, goats and a stylized Sacred Tree, perhaps a Palmette Tree, and the Guilloche. Mitannian glyptic regularly uses the Heraldic Poses, couchant, rampant, and regardant, and is particularly fond of the Antithetical Group<sup>26</sup> though still continues to use the Mirror Reverse from the Old Syrian Style. Woolley reminds us that at this time all Egyptian symbolism disappears from the seals found at Alalakh and they follow the current Syrian-Mitannian repertoire.<sup>27</sup> Apart from seals, the Quatrefoil, Rosette, Papyrus and Scale are worked on small items and in embroideries.<sup>28</sup> In this period Aegean art accepts the other ten eastern motifs of specialized subject matter. The art of the MMIII-LMIIa period in Crete and the art of Grave Circles B and A at Mycenae and the LHI seals reveal extensive use of the full repertoire of the Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Group, Mirror Reverse, Master of Animals, Mistress of Animals, Sphinx, Griffin, Dragon, Crocodile, and the Animals at the Tree of Life. All these motifs could have come into Minoan and Mycenaean art by way of Syria where all were in use at the time.<sup>29</sup> Whether they all went first into Minoan art and then on to Mycenaean art is another matter. The iconographical investigations in Chapter 2 reveal that the Mistress of Animals dons the elaborate Minoan costume and that the swelling

---

25. BUCH pp. 165-179.

In this terminology I follow Buchanan rather than Frankfort, FRANK CS. Compare PORADA (1948a), The Second Syrian Group.

26. For example see BUCH 907-21, 933-5.

27. ALAL pp. 259-60 and Pl. LXI 22-34, Pl. LXII 35-46. Levels VI and V.

28. See the appropriate sections on each motif above pp. 90, 86, 80, 93.

29. Note that several of them have been domiciled in Syria for many centuries but Aegean art did not accept them. Only the floral motifs, the Rosette, Quatrefoil, Papyrus, Palm and Palmette may have migrated earlier.

Thoueris shape is modified to match the Minoan male form, thus suggesting that both sojourned in Crete first. The actual transference of Egyptian Thoueris and Mesopotamian Tree-Watering Ritual Motif to Crete was effected in the previous period through contact with the East in MMII-III times when all the non-Minoan iconographical details were current in the Syrian area, both the Egyptian Thoueris elements in Byblos and the Mesopotamian elements of animal associations, vase, water, and foliate motifs, in Syria further north.<sup>30</sup> The chronological gap between the Water Dispensing Goddess at Mari and the Minoan Genius on the Late Minoan seal 136 is spanned by the Old Palace examples with ewer, branch, and water, so that the distinctive spouted ewer and spirals "signifying flowing water" could be a Minoan rendering of the rounded vase and wavy lines signifying flowing water of the Flowing Vase motif of the Mesopotamian tradition. However with all the other migrating motifs there are no iconographical details which contra-indicate simultaneous transference from the East to both Crete and Mycenae. The dating of non-pottery examples as MMIII rather than LMIIa is not always so secure that it can be absolutely certain each motif has a Minoan example preceding a Mycenaean one.<sup>31</sup> Further, some of the best examples of the motifs like Heraldic Poses and Antithetical Groups are designs on small finds from the Shaft Graves and on LHI seals where the motifs are worked in Mycenaean, not Minoan, style.<sup>32</sup> Neither the Sphinx nor

---

30. Above p. 174.

31. SANDARS (1961) pp. 17-18 discusses this very problem of priority while endeavouring to establish the ancestry of the first Aegean swords. She comes to the conclusion that eastern influence on Mycenaean swords of Type B must have been direct to the Mainland, pp. 24-5.

32. Above, *Introduction* pp. 5-7.

the Griffin began in Mycenaean art with the Cretan Adder Mark, but acquired it for a period, and then divested themselves of it. Both then went on to be more widely and effectively used in Mycenaean than in Minoan art, particularly the spirited Griffin. For all these iconographical reasons it is necessary to consider a simultaneous infusion of eastern influence into Crete at the time of the New Palaces, and into the Mainland at the very end of the MH Period and in LHI, the time of Grave Circle B and the Shaft Graves of Circle A.

The other aspect of motif transference in this period is the acceptance in the East of Aegean designs. Firstly there is the continuation of spiraliform designs throughout the New Kingdom with a gradual "slowing-down" of their rapport effect. This usage may be a continuation of the Spiral forms accepted in the Middle Kingdom, or may be the result of fresh Aegean contact, or, more probably, a combination of the two.<sup>33</sup> Secondly there is the set of motifs including the Flying Gallop and Griffin with Adder-Marked wing which occur in Egypt in the early 16th century in the jewellery of Ah-hotpe, motifs so specialized that they have long been recognized as of Aegean inspiration and direct inspiration at that.<sup>34</sup> Thirdly there is the burst of animal designs in the first part of the 15th century in which the whole Flying Gallop repertoire is seen in 18th Dynasty tombs, the best example being that of Puimre. The quality of many of these is such that no intermediary could be allowed. The transference must be direct from either Minoan or Mycenaean art to Egyptian.<sup>35</sup>

---

33. Above pp. 104-6, 158-9.

34. Above p. 109 and below pp. 182, 217.

35. FURUMARK (1950) pp. 215-21 believed there was little evidence for any Aegean influence in the East before c1450. His view on the origins of the Flying Gallop must now be corrected in the light of the Phaestos sealings, above pp. 107-8, and the evidence presented here for other motifs provides a fuller picture than was available then. Furumark even at that time did allow some Aegean traits in the Ah-hotpe dagger but believed the axe with the Griffin motif provided "an absolutely certain instance of Aegean influence", p. 220.

The last period, corresponding to the Mycenaean periods LHIIIA and IIIB, may be more of motif sharing rather than of motif transference. The International Repertoire has been established and the 14th and 13th century artist may draw on a wide variety of motifs, some belonging to his own tradition, some transferred from foreign traditions.

Four significant points emerge from this review of the timing and avenue of motif transferences. The first is the recognition of three periods of transference and one of motif sharing involving the Aegean and the East, with perhaps the centuries c1850 to 1750 and c1600 to 1500 being most important. Minoan art, as part of the cultural domination that the Cretan Palaces exercised in the Aegean area, was probably the initial receiver of the eastern motifs, subsequently to transmit them to the emerging Mycenaean art. However it should be recognized that the iconographical detail of many motifs allows that a direct transference to the Mainland from the East may also have occurred.

The second point is the role of the Syrian area in aiding the transferences, particularly the great cities of the area from the coast to the Euphrates. For the early periods Syria is linked to Mesopotamia through the great city of Mari which held an extraordinary position of cultural domination in this area until its destruction in 1758. Byblos provides a site where Mesopotamian and Egyptian influences are both at work. Ugarit in the Late Bronze Age shows Syrian, Egyptian, and Aegean features. Mention should also be made of the Mitanni who became so powerful in this area in the 16th and 15th centuries. Their influence was not only political and military but artistic as well.

The third point to emerge from the review of the timing and transference of motifs is that for each of the motifs that must have

transferred in each of the periods, there is a group of motifs which are used in conjunction and which may have transferred. These motifs are not specialized enough for their iconographical detail to argue transference and they have been assessed as indigenous creations in each area. It is however possible that they too represent transference, or perhaps the shaping of an incipient motif in Aegean art by the more developed detail of similar motifs in the older eastern traditions. At each stage the availability of models has been demonstrated in the Syrian area. To suggest that almost all the motifs of *Part I* are part of the artistic exchange between the Aegean and the East in the Bronze Age would be to press a case beyond the substantiating evidence of sporadic contact between the Aegean and the East before c1420. Nevertheless it should be recognized that the iconographical evidence and the exposition of motif groups, timing, and the role of Syria provide a cumulative and circumstantial case for extensive motif transference. Indeed they suggest a level of intercommunications between the Aegean and the East in advance of what the strict archaeological record can allow.

## The Intrusive Element

Following the recognition of an International Repertoire of artistic motifs for Late Bronze Age art, and of Aegean participation therein, several artistic issues arise, the first being the level of penetration of the transferring motif into the indigenous artistic tradition.

When the acceptance of a motif by the adoptive tradition results in a design where the new element is inserted into the over-all composition but artistically remains separate, bespeaking the fact that it is an exotic item, then the level of penetration may be termed the "Intrusive Element" stage. One of the clearest examples of this initial level of acceptance can be seen in the Mari frescoes.

289. Throne Podium from Mari - 18th C.  
The Running Spiral Border round the Investiture Fresco<sup>1</sup> at the Mari palace and the fresco fragment with a voluted papyriform design<sup>2</sup> are also important pieces. Though these examples pre-date comparable architectural decoration from the Aegean area, artistically they must be considered as Aegean-influenced pieces.<sup>3</sup> In all these cases the Aegean elements are still rendered in their Aegean style and are simply added to the over-all decor, no attempt being made to adapt them or relate them to the other motifs or designs.

Chapter 2 to 4 have illustrate many other examples of this stage of assimilation.

78. Ishtar Figure and Flying Gallop on a Cypriot Cylinder.  
The goddess's robes are unchanged and the bull's pose is unrelated to any other piece of the design.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. PARROT (1958) Fig. 50 and Pl. A.

2. Ibid., Figs. 10, 11.

3. Above pp. 102, 105, 159.

4. Reference should be made to the full discussion of each piece at the appropriate point in *Part I*. Only a brief comment pertinent to this discussion is entered here in *Part II*.

- 174A. Several Egyptian motifs on a Syrian Cylinder.  
The Egyptian elements are simply added in with the Mesopotamian ones.<sup>5</sup>
- 208. Lotus flowers on a Syrian Piece.  
The flowers are the Egyptian form unchanged.
- 248. Falcon Heads on a sword grip from Mycenae.  
These look decidedly Egyptian, even to the use of the Feather Scale Pattern.
- 271. The Guilloche worked on Cypriot Seals.
- 272. The elaborate Guilloche has a mistake in the interlocking at the top.
- 291. Spirals on Hittite and Syrian Seals.
- 292. Some are imperfectly handled.
- 293. Spiraliform Designs in Egyptian Paintings.
- 294. The Boat Canopy example may represent imported fabric.
- 304. Running Spirals on Tutankhamun's Earrings.  
The overall Syrian character remains, in spite of the intrusive Aegean design.
- 305A. Running Spirals on Syrian Pieces.
- 306. One is well-wrought, the other incorrect.
- 307. Spiraliform Designs on Hittite Pieces.
- 308. The difficult interlocking C-Spiral design is correctly handled; the S-Spiral is not.
- 312. Aegean elements in the jewellery of Ah-hotpe.  
A mixture of various motifs. Ah-hotpe has an Aegean Griffin on her axe and the animals in Flying Leap on her sword.<sup>6</sup>
- 313. Flying Gallop on Syrian Cylinder.  
This is rendered in a truly Aegean manner.
- 324. Aegean(?) Bull Pose on a Hittite Relief.  
There is just a suggestion of the Intrusive Element in this pose and the accompanying hunt scene.
- 339. Star Disk and Crescent on Mycenaean Signet.  
This is similar to 143.
- 349. Scale Mountain in Minoan Glyptic.
- 350.
- 367. Marbling on an Enkomi Box.
- 383. Marbling on an Alalakh Fresco.  
Other frescoes from the same palace depict a grass motif and bull's horns which look decidedly Minoan.<sup>7</sup>

Apart from these examples where the Intrusive Element level is clear because the transferring motif is juxtaposed against the rest of the design which is indigenous, there are several other examples

---

5. BUCH pp. 166, 177.

6. SCHACHERMEYR (1967) 77, SMITH IN Fig. 37. Also below p. 217.

7. ALAL, Pl. XXXVIII.

where the whole piece represents the transferring motif. These pieces indicate the same level of artistic penetration though they may be harder to identify because there are no other indigenous elements in the composition to throw the exotic motif into relief. Often however, the piece is such a clear copy of the foreign motif that it is possible to make such an identification, particularly when the details of the design are handled in a coarse or incorrect manner that bespeaks unfamiliarity with the subtleties of the original design. Again there are examples from *Part I*.

- 16. Winged Sun Disk in Syria.  
There is confusion over Uraeus and legs.
- 134. Thueris Figurine in Byblos.  
The crocodile cape is included, but the feet of the figure are human feet.
- 204. Pectoral from Byblos.  
A copy of an Egyptian type, but coarser work.
- 95, 97, 135, 187, 290, 305B, 314. Each of these may represent the Intrusive Element level, but it is also possible that they are imports, either pieces carelessly worked in their own tradition, or pieces from some transitional area.

Transferring motifs which reach only this level of penetration, or less, were discussed in Chapter 3. As far as Aegean art is concerned the Smiting Figure and the Winged Sun Disk do not appear as motifs, but some of the Star Disk in Crescent repertoire and the Scale Mountain do appear as Intrusive Elements. Aegean motifs such as the Fish, Octopus, Nautilus, Rocky Landscape and Glen are not found in the East, though reflections of the Duel and Bull Sports and some Dolphin, Tri-curved Arch, Marbling and Colour Wave motifs occur in isolated eastern examples as Intrusive Elements in the design. Another set of examples revealing this level of penetration is the group of Syrian cylinders identified by Henri Seyrig as of Aegean inspiration.<sup>8</sup> They show Aegean motifs such as the Duel, or Hunting

---

8. SEYRIG (1963) pp. 253-60 describes six such seals.



Scenes, handled in an Aegean manner. These are Intrusive Elements as in all aspects the cylinders belong to the Asian cylinder seal tradition. Other examples come from the treasure of Tutankhamun, which must represent the best work the 14th century world could produce. The hundreds of rich pieces are mostly worked in purely Egyptian style, as is only to be expected, but there are some where the design includes motifs which cannot be explained by reference to Egyptian artistic tradition.

- 467. Cedar Throne of Tutankhamun from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII. A beautiful piece, the purest Egyptian art, yet on each side a gold strip reveals a perfectly wrought Running Spiral.<sup>9</sup>
- 468. Child's chair belonging to Tutankhamun from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII. There are embossed gold panels on the side with Running Spiral borders.
- 469. First State Chariot of Tutankhamun from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII. The chariot designs include purely Egyptian motifs like Hieroglyphs, the Union Symbol, and the Binding of Pharaoh's Enemies, as well as motifs from the International Repertoire like the two seen here, the Aegean Running Spiral and the composite floral pattern. Both form Intrusive Elements in the overall Egyptian character of the piece.
- 470. Second State Chariot of Tutankhamun from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII. The central panel is again purely Egyptian, but the curved side panel shown here shows the Scale Pattern, Running Spiral, and Rosettes<sup>10</sup> contrasted against the Egyptian Feather Pattern and inset Eye panel.

It is most interesting to see foreign motifs accepted on Egyptian pieces so important as the thrones and chariots of Pharaoh. However, artistically, the foreign motifs do not alter the overall Egyptian character of the pieces, but remain Intrusive Elements.

---

9. Compare Tutankhamun's circular stool, also a purely Egyptian design except for the Running Spiral round the edge, CARTER (1933) Pl. XVIIIIA.

10. Compare also the Rosette border on the chest, CARTER (1923) Pls. L, LI, which follows the Aegean usage and is also seen on the painted patterns at Malkata, 411.

## 6 THE FOREIGN MOTIF IN THE INDIGENOUS STYLE

### The Incorporated Element

When the motif is fully accepted into the local art, when it is adapted so that it can form, together with the indigenous motifs, a new cohesive design, it has achieved a deeper level of penetration into the indigenous tradition than the one previously discussed, and may be termed the "Incorporated Element". Many examples investigated in *Part I* reveal eastern motifs penetrating Aegean art, or Aegean motifs moving into eastern tradition to this level.

17 to 30. Heraldic Poses in the Aegean.

The Mycenaean refinements in 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, reveal full acceptance of the motif.<sup>1</sup>

36, 41 to 46. The Antithetical Group in the Aegean.

The importance of 46 has already been stressed.

36A to 68B, 71 to 76. Master of Animals in the Aegean form.

79 to 82, 87 to 92. Mistress of Animals in the Aegean form.

98, 103 to 108. Sphinx in the Aegean form.

113, 114. The Minoan and Theran Griffin.

115, 116, 123 to 128. The Griffin, a Mycenaean creature.

136 to 140, 143 to 148. Thouris becomes the Minoan Genius.

162, 165, 166. The Animals at the Tree of Life, Mycenaean style.

303. Interlocking Spiral Pattern with Rosettes on an Egyptian Ceiling.

The integration of Egyptian and Aegean motifs helps form the composition. Several Egyptian ceilings show similar integrated designs as in 218.<sup>2</sup>

321 to 323. Flying Gallop Repertoire, Egyptian style.

These three are lesser known examples. The famous hunting scenes on 18th Dynasty Tombs make much more spectacular use of the Aegean motifs.<sup>3</sup>

325. The Flying Gallop at home in Cyprus.

- 
1. Reference should be made to the full discussion of the pieces in *Part I*. Only brief comments are noted here.
  2. Other examples are noted under the discussions of 218 and 303 above. See also SCHACHERMEYER (1967) 111.
  3. Particularly the Tombs of Puimre, Rekhmire, Usherhet, and Amenemhet. See the discussion on the Flying Gallop, above pp. 108, 143.

In Syria which is such an important area so far as motif transference is concerned, the Incorporated Element level of motif acceptance is found in the following examples from *Part I*.

- 47 to 48B, 53. Egyptian Mirror Reverse wrought in Syrian terms.
- 64B. The Master of Animals, Syrian adaptation.
- 83. Mistress of Animals and Sphinx, a Syrian blend of Mesopotamian, Egyptian and Aegean elements.
- 94A, B, 99A to 100. The Egyptian Sphinx Syrianized, particularly the female form with hands in 99A, 100.
- 110, 117 to 119. The Syrian Griffin.  
It is slender, but sometimes plays the predator, as does the Mitannian Griffin.
- 151, 152A. The Syrian Sacred Tree.  
Animals at the Tree of Life.
- 188, 196. Papyrus in Syrian style.  
Volutes, and a Palmette Tree composition.
- 212, 221. Rosettes in Syrian fashion.
- 253. Syria's use of the Scale Feather Pattern.  
The whole piece is inspired by Egyptian cosmetic boxes in the form of a duck.
- 267, 268, 270. Regular Syrian forms of the Guilloche following Mesopotamian and Hittite models.
- 331B, 333. The Weather God in Syrian garb.  
The Smiting Figure in Syrian art.
- 338. Star Disk in Crescent.  
A fine Syrian seal with integrated Babylonian and Syrian motifs.

The Incorporated Element is seen in Hittite art in the following twelve examples.

- 37. The Antithetical Group renders Hittite gods.
- 64A. A Hittite Winged Demon is Master of Animals.
- 101. The Sphinx as Guardian to a Hittite Gate.  
It incorporates the Syrian female form and Aegean elements in the crest.
- 112. A neat Hittite Griffin on a Stamp Seal.
- 153, 155. Sacred Tree and other motifs given a Hittite cast.
- 214, 219. The Rosette studs the centre of a design composed of Hittite cuneiform script, and then provides the fill ornament for an elaborate ivory carving of Hittite deities.
- 332, 334A. The Smiting Figure in Hittite art.  
Weather God/Mountain God.
- 334. Winged Sun Disk adapted to Hittite iconography.
- 348. The Scale Mountain is fused with a Hittite god.

Mitannian use of exotic motifs at the Incorporated Element level is exemplified by the following pieces.

- 35. The Antithetical Group organizes various motifs in Mitannian layers.
- 65, 66. Master of Animals and Struggling Hero in Mitannian form.
- 152, 154A, B, 156. The Sacred Tree is here the Mitannian Bouquet Tree in 152B and 156, and more foliate in the other examples.

The Cypriot examples of the Incorporated Element level provide some very interesting conversions.

- 38 to 40. The Antithetical Group organizes various foreign motifs and Cypriot elements into co-ordinated designs, though sometimes with difficulty.
- 69A to 70B. Cypriot Contest Scenes.
- 84 to 86B. The Mistress of Animals in Cypriot garb.
- 102. Sphinxes with Aegean and Syrian elements form with other motifs a somewhat cluttered Cypriot cylinder design.
- 120, 121B to 122B. Griffins, attenuated as they are sometimes found in Cypriot glyptic.
- 158 to 160. The Sacred Tree in Cypriot art usually takes the form of a Palmette Tree.
- 213, 220. Cypriot Rosettes are often seen.  
In 213 the Rosettes are linked with Bucrania, and they have the triple layer of double petals in 220.
- 279, 280. Scroll Pattern and other eastern motifs in Cypriot glyptic style.
- 334B. The Smiting Figure in fine Cypriot work.
- 340. The Star Disk in Crescent repertoire is regularly used on Cypriot cylinders.

Other eastern examples of the Incorporated Element are provided by the four Late Bronze Age pieces 471 to 474.

- 471. Cylinder Seal of Saustatar from Nuzi - c1500.  
Many elements (Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Groups, Master of Animals and the Mitannian Pillar of Heaven) form a composition freely treating the surface area. This appears to be a Mitannian characteristic as opposed to the traditional Mesopotamian composition of treating the seal surface as a true frieze.
- 472. Cylinder Seal from Chagar Bazar - Mitannian.  
The design is more successfully handled here and the symmetry and play on the diagonal is a delight. Again there is a mixture of motifs, Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Group, Master of Animals, Griffins, birds, scorpions.
- 473. Cylinder Seal - Mid-Assyrian.<sup>4</sup>  
Most of the motifs used are those which have come to belong to the International Repertoire. There is great similarity in the design to the Mitannian seal above.

---

4. PORADA (1948a) 592E. Listed with Assyrian cylinders of 14th century, the seal is allowed "dependence on Mitannian designs", pp. 67-8.

474. Three Pendants from Ugarit - Late Bronze Age.  
The Nude Female with various motifs.  
Details include the Hathor hair style, Papyrus,  
Celestial Symbols, and Mistress of Animal role.

The Incorporated Element level of penetration is much more important for the study of artistic interrelation than the Intrusive Element level, for it is the one which truly reflects the assimilation of the foreign motif into the indigenous style. When a foreign motif reaches this level of penetration it could be termed a "migrating", rather than a transferring, motif.

## 6 THE FOREIGN MOTIF IN THE INDIGENOUS STYLE

### National Styles

While the term "National Styles"<sup>1</sup> usually signifies the characteristic style of a particular area or people, a style created out of purely indigenous elements, this is not necessarily the case in the ancient world. It has long been recognised that some national styles in the East have been greatly influenced from the earliest times by the arts of neighbouring areas. Part of this influence is the transference or migration of motifs and there are several examples of national styles which appear to have been shaped more by the fusion of indigenous and exotic elements than by any other influence.

The first example, the so-called Nuzi Ware, dates from the 15th to the 13th centuries and is the pottery of the Mitannians.<sup>2</sup> It gains its name from the site where most examples were found.<sup>3</sup> Other examples are known from Assur and Nineveh further east and from Ugarit and Alalakh to the west. At this latter site a variant of the original style was developed, the Atchana ware.<sup>4</sup>

#### 475. Nuzi Pottery Designs, Alalakh - 15th-13th C.

Designs on Nuzi and Atchana Pottery.

The colour scheme is white on black.<sup>5</sup> The motifs include the Rosette, Papyrus, Guilloche, Quirk, Running Spiral, and a Scale Pattern (illustrated ALAL Pl. CIII). The Rosette is regularly used in a border or band form. There are also intricate Papyrus patterns, a development peculiar to Alalakh, and long pointed loops connecting elements of the design.

- 
1. The term National Style is preferable to "local", "regional" or "area" styles since it places more emphasis on the people concerned than does the geographical appellation. It also provides a neat contrast for the term, "International Style", below p. 196. With the use of "National" here, there is no intention of suggesting political unity.
  2. Frankfort reminds us that "a distinctively Mitannian style of design is found only on seals and on pottery". FRANK AA p. 141.
  3. STARR (1937, 39) for the excavations at Nuzi.
  4. ALAL pp. 347-50.
  5. At least the desired colour scheme. Often imperfect firing caused a reddish background instead of black. ALAL p. 348.

Frankfort does not wish to allow any Aegean influence since the vogue of light on dark Kamares ware is long since past and many of the designs are Asiatic anyway.<sup>6</sup> Smith would allow some Cretan influence.<sup>7</sup> On the matter of the Papyrus development, Woolley believes the Cretan influence is undeniable and suggests an archaistic revival from a chance find of surviving Kamares fragments.<sup>8</sup> Such an explanation of the re-establishment of artistic designs is quite feasible. However it may not be necessary in this case since dotted Papyrus forms were current in LMII and LHII and III pottery designs<sup>9</sup> and certainly entwined Papyrus forms are known from examples of Syrian foliate patterns. The best explanation would be to allow contemporary Aegean influence in the Rosette bands, Running Spiral bands, the Papyrus forms, and in the looping connections which could be derived from the Ogival Canopy motif of LHII pottery. These would then be Aegean motifs accepted to the level of the Incorporated Element so that the resulting fusion of the Aegean motifs with motifs from the International Repertoire and with indigenous motifs, forms the distinctive Nuzi designs.

In the Aegean area itself there is a Late Bronze Age creation which can only be interpreted as an example of eastern influences shaping art in this western sphere. These are the Aegean Cylinder Seals.

476. Cylinder Seal from Knossos - LMII.  
A somewhat cluttered composition.  
Bull-man, lion, Sphinx, Animal Attack  
(Lion attacking deer with young(?)).<sup>10</sup>

- 
6. FRANK AA pp. 142-3.  
7. SMITH IN p. 104.  
8. ALAL p. 350.  
9. FURU Fig. 33.  
10. Frankfort discusses this design, FRANK CS p. 203, and also the Astrakous cylinder, p. 304. This latter seal has a similar repertoire, PM IV Fig. 383.

477. Cylinder Seal from Pylos - LHII.  
A quite uncluttered composition.  
Griffin sejant elevated beside a striding Man.  
The LMIIIA seal 73 also shows men and Griffins  
naturalistically while a more linear treatment  
of Griffins, lions, goats, birds and fish is  
known from other Aegean seals.<sup>11</sup>
478. Cylinder Seal from Golgoi - LHIIIA.  
Only the composition of the main design is clear.  
Master of the Animals subduing at hind paw two  
Lions inverted regardant. In the field Goat, Lion,  
Goat, Lion, winged Griffin (?) showing Heraldic Poses  
rampant and couchant. Comparisons are the cylinders  
from Crete<sup>12</sup> and from Kakovatos, 144.
479. Cylinder Seal from Enkomi - 15th-14th C.  
Master of Animals subduing at ear two Lions  
rampant on altars, regardant. Above as attendants,  
two Birds elevated. Minoan Genius with Ewer, Griffin  
in the Flying Gallop, elevated above. In field  
Dolphin, Head, Star, Scrolls(?).  
The number of Aegean elements on this Cypriot seal  
deserves comment.<sup>13</sup>
480. Cylinder Seal from Cyprus - Late Bronze Age.  
Griffin statant elevated (or winged goat?)  
Lion leaping (?), in field foliate designs.  
The placement of the figures at right angles to  
the run of the seal is apparently an Aegean feature,  
seen also in 476, 478.
481. Cylinder Seal - LM/LH.  
Fish leaping.  
The Aegean subject and the diagonal composition can  
be compared to the leaping dolphins on the cylinder  
from east Crete.<sup>14</sup>

Frankfort notes the cylinder seal creations of the western  
area in his Section 46, "The Cylinders of the Aegean",<sup>15</sup> and Porada  
speaks of an Aegean Style of cylinder designs in her section on Cypriot

- 
11. CMS I 206, 284, CMS VII 94, 174 (barrel-shaped), CMS XII 210.
12. PM IV Fig. 383.
13. See also Frankfort's discussion of the piece, FRANK CS p. 303.
14. PM IV Fig. 435. Other cylinder seals from the Aegean area with  
linear designs are CMS IV 100, 101, 102 of MMI date, and CMS  
VIII 134 of MM II-III date. CMS IX 185 is labelled Mycenaean,  
and PM IV Fig. 434 is in the talismanic style. Three cylinder  
seals from Palaikastro show Antithetical Group compositions,  
ECCLES (1939-40) Figs. 16-18.
15. FRANK CS pp. 300-4.  
See also the list of cylinders which have been found in the Aegean  
area provided by BASS (1967) pp. 152-9. Of the 82 cylinders dated  
before 1200, 30 are probably of Aegean workmanship.



seals<sup>16</sup> while Kenna discusses the cylinders of Crete and Cyprus.<sup>17</sup> However the discussion here is concerned to recognize the creation of a new style, to recognize that Aegean artists have taken the cylinder seal, in itself a foreign art form, and have worked on it a variety of motifs from different traditions, but fused them to give a characteristic Aegean cast to the composition.

The third example of a national style created by a blend of indigenous and exotic motifs is the Mycenaean Ivory Style. Selected elements of the Minoan Flying Gallop repertoire and the contorted poses of the Mycenaean Animal Attack produce, in the hand of an Aegean artist, the spirited compositions of the Aegean Animal Style.<sup>18</sup> At the same time the eastern motifs of Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Groups, Sphinxes and Griffins are well assimilated in Mycenaean art. The fusion of these elements by the skilful hand of the Mycenaean ivory carver produces a distinctive national style that had great appeal in the ancient world.

482. Carved Pyxis from Athens - LHIIIA.  
Two Griffins hunting Deer.<sup>19</sup> The Griffins are Mycenaean in all details except the paws, which are rendered as hooves, a detail for which there seems to be no parallel. The whole spirit of the composition is that of the Mycenaean Animal Attack, where the Flying Gallop and contorted poses of the Aegean Animal Style are used to superb effect. The border is the Aegean double leaf.
483. Cut-out Inlay from Delos - LHIIIB.  
Combat of a Lion and a Griffin.  
The Mycenaean Animals' Attack theme is again worked with all the expected details; the strength of the limbs, the Flying Leap of the Griffin, the wings displayed. The displayed pose borrowed from the Mycenaean Heraldic Poses repertoire is used to advantage here. A similar attack composition is seen on another piece from Delos. A lion and a bull attack each other and the lion has the eastern hair whorl.<sup>20</sup>

16. PORADA (1948a) pp. 150-1. One example 1077 is given.

17. KENNA (1967d) and 1968c).

18. See above pp. 165-6.

19. IMMERWAHR (1971) Pl. 32, pp. 106-7.

20. KANTOR (1956) Fig. 2A. This is taken to be a natural animal hide mark with a long history in Near Eastern art. See above p. 148.

484. Relief Plaque from Byblos - 13th C.  
A Griffin and a Lion attack a Bull.  
This is an Animal Attack with action, violence, and contortion. The lion-bull attack on the plaque from Spata, 320, is not so vividly portrayed.
485. Mirror Handle from Enkomi - 13th-12th C.  
Duel between a Warrior and a Griffin.  
A mirror from Enkomi where the Mycenaean motif of the Duel is seen rendered with all the characteristics outlined in that discussion, except that for a huge animal a formidable Griffin is substituted. It is a similar composition to the other mirror back showing a man-lion combat, 360, which is also in Mycenaean Ivory Style.
486. Relief Plaque from Megiddo - 13th C.  
Griffin couchant displayed erect.  
The heraldic beast with two features of Mycenaean creation, the wings displayed and head erect poses.

None of these pieces shows the Adder Mark but this detail is not essential for Mycenaean Griffins, and indeed, it tended to be ignored in the later examples of both Griffins and Sphinxes. The poses, the aggression, the great strong limbs, are the hallmarks of the Mainland lion and Griffin and so these examples are claimed as Mycenaean. Examples 482 and 483 from Athens and Delos may occasion little surprise in this list, but the others from Byblos, Cyprus, and Megiddo respectively, may cause some consternation so labelled. Frankfort wishes to recognize their Aegean influence,<sup>21</sup> as does Kantor,<sup>22</sup> and Vermeule lists the Megiddo example as Mycenaean.<sup>23</sup> Bisi lists all of them, but each in its own area, a division that does not recognize the close stylistic affinity.<sup>24</sup> More recently Blazquez would have both the Megiddo and Byblos pieces as Mycenaean work,<sup>25</sup> but

---

21. FRANK AA pp. 263-5.

22. KANTOR (1956) and (1960).

23. VERM Pl. XXXVII D.

24. BISI (1965) Figs. 8, 15, 19, Pl. V.

25. BLAZQUEZ (1972) p. 404. He also believes that the treatment of the wings is a Mycenaean characteristic.

Poursat inclines to Cypriot craftsmanship for the Megiddo and Delos pieces.<sup>26</sup>

The difference of opinion on the origin of these controversial pieces serves to indicate clearly how closely the Mycenaean and eastern elements have been blended. The discussions of Kantor and Blazquez are still the most enlightening on the problem, with Blazquez speaking of "ce mélange d'influences, mycèniennes et minoennes"<sup>27</sup> and Kantor giving two classifications of Mycenaean influence, the "Hybrid Canaanite - Mycenaean" and the "Extreme Mycenaeanizing".<sup>28</sup> Classification of the Mycenaean Ivory Style proposed here would include the pieces listed in Kantor's "Extreme Mycenaeanizing" type and also all the Byblos, Megiddo, Enkomi, and Kouklia examples listed in her "Canaanite-Mycenaean" type. The latter examples have more eastern elements in their compositions than the former,<sup>29</sup> but this is not enough to counteract the Mycenaean spirit of the pieces, particularly the combat scenes with Griffins.<sup>30</sup>

The Mycenaean accepted the Mitannian Griffin but not the Griffin Demon into their art. They accepted its crest (curl and three elements), its elevated wings, its Heraldic Poses, and added

---

26. POURSAT (1973) p. 422. He notes the details of mane and tail treatment and does not consider it close enough to the Mainland examples to allow Mycenaean craftsmanship. I find this argument unconvincing, since there are examples in Mycenaean metal work and glyptic to compare. See 12 and 55.  
POURSAT (1977a), in a most important recent study of Mycenaean ivories, devotes two chapters to the problems of recognizing overseas workshops and foreign influences, pp. 141-69, 225-48.

27. BLAZQUEZ (1972) p. 409.

28. KANTOR (1956) pp. 167-8.

29. Perhaps a Cypriot origin would explain the extra eastern influence, or the working of Mycenaean craftsmen in some Levantine port.

30. See the section on Mycenaean Style in the *Introduction*, pp. 5-7, and the motifs Griffin and Duel, pp. 47-54, 121-3.

their own details of elaborate crest, wings displayed, and head erect. It is not so clear whether they also took the active leaping attacking role from Syria and Mitanni. That role was clearly established there but it did not appear to find a home in Crete and it is possible the violent Mycenaean Griffins may be an independent creation. Certainly what is distinctively Mycenaean is the use of the Griffin as a major motif in LHIIIA and B. Wherever it appears even in conjunction with a lion, it is a main feature, not part of a subsidiary design which was always its place in Syrian and Mitannian glyptic. Certainly the Mycenaean delighted to use this motif on seals, and large scale frescoes as well as the ivories. They used it much more than the Sphinx and much more than the Minoans used either Sphinx or Griffin. Out of it they created a magnificent heraldic beast and they also exploited its predatory nature to have it attacking deer, lions, even a Mycenaean Warrior. Perhaps no other eastern motif became so surely imbedded in Mycenaean art or was so vigorously re-worked to give it a thoroughly Mycenaean character, and it is given its most forthright statement in examples of the Mycenaean Ivory Style.

The detailed discussion of these three local examples, Nuzi ware, the Aegean Cylinder Seals, and the Mycenaean Ivory style, gives some insight into the formation of those styles which are particularly shaped by the fusion of indigenous and exotic elements. That fusion has resulted in a new style characteristic of the national art. It is the Incorporated Element level of assimilation worked to its highest pitch.

## 7 THE INTERNATIONAL STYLE

### Ornate and Severe

The classifications of Intrusive Element and Incorporated Element are not however sufficient to explain the composition of all pieces of Late Bronze Age art using non-indigenous motifs. There is a small group of rich pieces which carry designs where the elements are certainly fused, but they do not have the mark of any particular national style. Many scholars have noted these pieces and discussed their origin, most recently Stevenson Smith, who in his *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East*, coins the phrase "International Style" to describe such designs. He uses the term to cover a wide variety of examples from the 16th to the 13th centuries and stresses the small, costly nature of the items and the difficulty of specifying their source. He believes northern Syria to have been important in its development and lists two of the motifs which helped form the Style as the Syrian Palmette and the voluted tree. He gives as examples of pieces worked in the Style, the Ugarit Bed Panels, the Ugarit Bowls, the Cyprus Rhyton and the Cyprus and Dendra Bowls, and the Nuzi Wall Paintings.<sup>1</sup>

It does not seem possible to use a term to cover such a wide variety of examples without robbing it of precision. The use of the word "Style" would suggest cohesive integrated designs revealing the characteristics of some particular school of craftsmen, or the idiosyncratic flair of an individual artist. Stevenson Smith's wide variety of examples do not show this consistency and thus cannot claim to be classified as belonging to a single style. For this reason

---

1. SMITH IN p. 32 and also pp. 107, 44, 109, 97, 113 and 18. Except for the Dendra Bowl, the examples mentioned are all illustrated in this thesis, 196, 491, 502, 326, 514, 454.

the term International Style should be restricted to just those Late Bronze Age pieces which do have such cohesion and integration of design. The initial indicators of the pieces carrying designs in the International Style would remain Stevenson Smith's two points - that they are usually small costly items and that it is never clear just exactly where is the source of their manufacture. Accordingly, out of Stevenson Smith's list quoted above only the Ugarit Bowls and the Cyprus Rhyton and the Cyprus and Dendra Bowls would here be classified as wrought in the International Style. The question then arises of the classification of the other examples in Stevenson Smith's list. In view of the arguments in the preceding chapters, it can be seen that these pieces are wrought in national styles using motifs which belong to the International Repertoire. The Ugarit Bed Panels show the volute tree of the International Repertoire, but the other motifs were originally Egyptian motifs applying to the close family of Pharaoh, and are now worked in a Syrian style. The Nuzi Wall paintings again are the result of the national art, this time Mitannian art, accepting even to the Incorporated Element level, motifs from the International Repertoire.

The Ugarit bowls and other examples of the International Style comprising pieces from the Tutankhamun and Tell Basta Treasures and rich finds from Syria, Cyprus, and Anatolia are discussed in 487 to 503.

487. Dagger Sheath of Tutankhamun from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII. Among the motifs used are the Running Spiral, Flying Gallop repertoire, Palmette, Rosette and composite floral forms. The hunting scene does not show animals fully extended as in the best Aegean renderings of the Flying Gallop repertoire, but they are placed freely in the field as is the Aegean mode, later adopted by Egyptian artists. Some of the animal poses come from the tradition of Egyptian hunting scenes.<sup>2</sup>

---

2. KANTOR (1947a) pp. 66-8 and above, p. 165.

488. Dagger Sheath of Tutankhamun from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
A Guilloche border frames a central composite panel which is like the floral segment in 487.
489. The Bow Case of Tutankhamun from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
A hunting scene as in 487 has the same tangle of animal poses placed in a free field and the same fill technique using small plant forms.<sup>3</sup>
490. Tutankhamun's Cosmetic Jar from Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Here the Egyptian piece carries two not-wholly-Egyptian panels front and back. These panels are worked with hunting scenes containing the same blend of elements as 487 and 489 above.<sup>4</sup>
491. Gold Bowl from Ugarit - 14th-13th C.<sup>5</sup>  
This repousse bowl shows the International Style most elaborately wrought. A wide selection of motifs from the International Repertoire is used. It includes Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Group, Sphinx, Griffin, Sacred Tree (volute tree), Papyrus, Rosette, Spiral and Flying Gallop. The background is filled with the small plant motifs noticed also in 487, 489 and 490.
492. Bronze Foil from Tyre - 13th C.<sup>6</sup>  
This piece contemporary with 491 uses a similar range of motifs from the International Repertoire but substitutes the Guilloche for the running Spiral as the border pattern. Again plant motifs are used as fill ornament.  
This is also seen in the Cyprus Rhyton, 326.
493. Gold Earrings from Enkomi - 13th C.<sup>7</sup>  
The Bulls' Heads are covered with the foliate designs which belong both to the International Repertoire and the International Style. Comparisons are the foliate compositions of 487, 488, and examples 491 and 492 above.
494. First Silver Jug of Atumemtoneb from Bubastis - 13th C.<sup>8</sup>
496. Detail of two engraved registers.  
The top register shows an animal attack scene directly comparable to 491 and 492. The lower register shows the traditional Egyptian scene of fowling in the marshes.

- 
3. The form of plant clumps in Minoan frescoes bears comparison here. CAMERON (1968) Fig. 13.
4. For other examples of the International Style in Tutankhamun's treasure see CARTER (1923) Pl. LXVIIB, open work sheet gold; Pl. LXII, granulation; SCHACHERMEYR (1967) 165, sheet gold.
5. FRANK AA pp. 149-51 allows a blend of Minoan, Egyptian and Syrian elements.
6. FRANK AA p. 151.
7. Compare also the somewhat plainer bull earrings, KARAGEORGHIS (1976b) VII.
8. Reference should be made to the full discussion of these pieces 494 to 500 in SIMPSON (1960). I have accepted Simpson's arguments for a 13th century date for both the Tell Basta Treasure finds.

495. Second Silver Jug of Atumemtoneb from Bubastis - 13th C.  
 498. Detail of inscribed designs.  
 Hieroglyphs head an animal scene set in the papyrus marshes.  
 The Egyptian handling of the Papyrus in the left hand piece where the clumps spring from the base line and are head height is clear. In the right hand piece the papyrus are made into little clumps and interspersed through the design as in 487, 489. The rampant goat possibly belongs to an Animals at the Tree of Life scene.
497. Third Silver Jog of Atumemtoneb from Bubastis - 13th C.  
 Detail of inscribed designs.  
 The Aegean motifs of the running Spiral border and Flying Gallop blend happily with the Egyptian lotus border and Papyrus scene. In addition the decoration on the base section of each jug has affinities with the Aegean arcade pattern while the animal handles seem Syrian.
499. Silver Bowl from Bubastis - 13th C.  
 500. Detail of the registers of the design.  
 Amid the many scenes of traditional Egyptian type, like fishing and fowling in the marshes, are these two which show scenes on the desert margin. In the first, handling of the birds, palm, foliate clumps, and in the second the spirited animal poses of the lion hunt, all argue the designs as wrought in the International Style.
501. Gold Repousse Disk from Izmir(?) - 13th C.<sup>10</sup>  
 The design is again organised in concentric bands, but the dividing borders are this time Rosette bands. Most of the motifs are from the International Repertoire; Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Group, Volute Tree, Winged Sun Disk, Rosette. The absence of spirited Aegean animal poses is to be noted.

Twelve pieces have now been discussed where the designs are a fusion of Syrian (some originally Mesopotamian or Mitannian), Egyptian, and Aegean elements, some with extra Cypriot or Hittite blends. These designs belong to the International Style, whose characteristic is the masterly fusion of voluted plants, foliate

- 
9. In fact the Aegean element is not perhaps fully recognised in SIMPSON (1960), especially in his discussions of the animal scenes, though he does refer to KANTOR (1947a).
10. From a "Treasure" of several fine pieces, said to have been found near Izmir.  
 KANTOR (1957) pp. 145-55 gives a very full discussion of the design and, to explain the mixture of elements, proposes an artistic milieu "in which it would have been possible for a Syrian goldsmith using a technique characteristic for Cyprus, to incorporate Hittite elements in his design".  
 AKUR p. 144 accepts the Syrian workmanship.



clumps, animal combats or heraldic posings, all within a border of Running Spirals, or Rosette bands, or the Guilloche. It is an ornate and highly decorative style, which draws on the pool of motifs, the International Repertoire, but also incorporates some national elements.

Two other pieces, the second Ugarit Bowl and a fine seal from Cyprus are not so ornate, nor so eclectic in their composition, but they too belong to the International Style.

502. Golden Bowl from Ugarit - 14th-13th C.<sup>11</sup>  
 A hunting scene using the Flying Gallop repertoire.  
 Of interest is the circular design formed by the four animals with horns interlocked at the centre.
503. Cylinder Seal from Hala Sultan Tekke - Late Bronze Age.<sup>12</sup>  
 The number of motifs is worthy of comment.  
 Two Antithetical Groups.  
 Animals at the Tree of Life:  
   Two Lions rampant about a Palmette Tree,  
   Two Cubs couchant averted placed vertically  
   beside the Tree.  
 Master of Animals:  
   A Bull Genius subdues at hind leg a Griffin  
   regardant displayed inverted, and with a sceptre,  
   at front paw a Griffin rampant elevated.  
 In the field:  
   Above, Dog regardant in the Flying Leap,  
   but contorted.<sup>13</sup>  
   Below the Dog, an S-scroll vertically.  
   Above the Bull Genius's right arm, the  
   cuneiform script for 5.  
 Very similar in design to this seal is the other fine  
 seal from Cyprus, CCA3 77.

These examples have quite a different cast to the previous twelve, but in them the various elements from the different artistic traditions have been combined in a cohesive design that cannot really be assigned to any particular national style. If pieces are classified as examples of the International Style that is not to say all were made at the one place by the one school of craftsmen. What has been proposed is a style that surmounts national barriers so effectively

11. SMITH AA pp. 151-2.

12. CCA 3 p. 29.

13. This pose has been assessed as an Aegean element, belonging to the Animal Attack repertoire, but it should be noted that leaping, kneeling, animals are known in Middle Assyrian seals.

that it is difficult to decide on artistic grounds where the piece has been produced. If the example exhibits such a fusion of motifs from the International Repertoire and local elements that a new cohesive design, in what amounts to a supra-national style, is created, then the example is wrought in the International Style and that is the case with 502 and 503. It follows that there is not one International Style but two, an Ornate and a Severe Style.

The Ornate International Style is exemplified by the designs on the twelve pieces 487 to 501 and the Cyprus Rhyton 326.<sup>14</sup> In these, the designs show similar cohesive compositions which fuse together elements like voluted plant forms, animal attack scenes using the Flying Gallop repertoire, heraldically posed beasts, and set them in papyrus marshes, or in a free field placement with foliate clumps interspersed, and surround all with either the running Spiral or Rosette border, or the Guilloche. The pieces are all rich and finely wrought, and the find place may give no indication of their place of manufacture. If Tutankhamun's weapons are Syrian made, the alabaster jar is surely Egyptian - unless one allows an Egyptian craftsman to make the jar and import a Syrian to work in the same material and same technique to insert the International Style panel. The metal work may all be Syrian, but the earrings which were found in Cyprus could have been made there. The pieces from the Tell Basta Treasure are probably by an Egyptian hand rather than a Syrian,<sup>15</sup> if the conscious juxtaposition of the purely Egyptian panels with the panels in the International Style is any guide. The piece from Izmir, which has a

---

14. PELTENBURG (1972) suggests a classification for faience vases from Cyprus in two groups, Egyptian or Egyptianizing, and Western Asiatic. He would place this rhyton in the former group on the grounds of technique though he allows that motifs and style show the north Levantine characteristics of the latter group, p. 123. This North Levantine Style is allowed Mycenaean influence, p. 133, but the other subdivision the International Western Asiatic Style is not, p. 136.

15. SIMPSON (1960) pp. 43-4 gives a summary of previous interpretations before coming to his conclusion of Egyptian workmanship, which is accepted here.

more static design, could be Hittite, or Syrian or Cypriot made to suit Hittite taste. The internationalism extends to the clientele.

The Severe International Style is exemplified by the two pieces 502 and 503 and the Cyprus and Dendra Bowls.<sup>16</sup> This style must qualify for the international epithet, because as with the other, it shows the blend of various elements finely wrought in rich material. It is a severe style because the florid effect of the former designs is quite absent. There is instead an economy in the composition, a respect for the overall clarity of the design which must not be allowed to be obscured by inserting too many elements, or by cluttering up the background with plant clumps or fill ornament. Again the problem of place of manufacture is noted. Is the Ugarit Bowl with the hunting scene Syrian, made for a local client or a Mycenaean living in Ugarit? Or is it Mycenaean, made for the eastern market or for a Mycenaean living abroad? The fine seal was found in Cyprus, but could be Syrian, though the Griffins would suit a Mycenaean order – and who commissioned the cuneiform inscription?

The explanation of the origin of the two styles may be that the Ornate Style is created when Syrian influence is paramount, and the Severe Style when Mycenaean influence is dominant.<sup>17</sup> The creation of the Ornate Style is perhaps not to be found in Syria, but is possibly the result of the fusion of Aegean and Egyptian elements in early 18th Dynasty Egyptian art, with a subsequent elaboration by Syrian artists, treating the Egyptian motifs in their own inimitable

---

16. Below, 509, Illustration and discussion.

17. For comments on Mycenaean style see above pp. 5-6, 121-3, 149.

way, and adding their own highly decorative plant forms. Once the style becomes widely known in the 14th and 13th centuries, it can be used by artists in different areas, Egypt and Cyprus just as well as Syria and it would appear that the style is deliberately chosen at times as an alternative to their own national styles.<sup>18</sup> Designs in the Ornate International Style do not automatically mean Syrian craftsmanship nor do those in the Severe Style mean Mycenaean. On the contrary, being an International Style it is used by artists of other areas, Cypriots, Syrians, and Egyptians. However it is Mycenaean artistic restraint and Mycenaean interest in tight design which has shaped the Severe Style, and which still organises the composition of the best pieces whether made by a Mycenaean national or not.

It is not surprising that it has proved so difficult to define the International Style. Other scholars apart from Stevenson Smith, recognising the International Style phenomenon and aspects of the International Repertoire, have tried to deal with them by explaining various artistic "influences", and coining various compound terms. Frankfort noted "Phoenician syncretism, half a millennium before Phoenicians in the proper sense are known".<sup>19</sup> Henri Seyrig identified a "mycénisant" cylinder<sup>20</sup> and Vassos Karageorghis favours the term "Aegeo-Oriental style" for some works of the 14th and 13th centuries.<sup>21</sup> In her article on ivory carvings, Helene Kantor listed

---

18. The alternating of Egyptian and International panels in the Tell Basta jug, discussed above p. 201, is the clearest example of this conscious choice of the artist. No doubt the use of the International Style increased the marketability of the piece since it appealed to a wider clientele in the international world of the Late Bronze Age. The choice of Ornate or Severe Style may even be that of the client rather than the craftsman. See below Chapter 8.

19. FRANK AA p. 150 in discussing the Ugarit Bowl and the Tyre Foil.

20. SEYRIG (1955) pp. 30-4.

21. KARA p. 140. His placing of Cyprus as the centre for this style seems to give more importance to the island than is warranted, at least on the present artistic evidence.

classes of "Egyptianising, Canaanite proper, Hybrid Canaanite-Mycenaean, and Extreme Mycenaeanizing"<sup>22</sup> ivory styles in order to describe the blend of elements. In a later article, Kantor went on to declare that Greece had experienced two Orientalizing periods, the well-known 8th to 7th century period, and an earlier one of the 14th and 13th centuries. In the earlier period it was the decorative arts of the East that were "most receptive to Mycenaean influence. On Cyprus and in Syria and Palestine the example of Mycenaean art resulted in a Mycenaean-influenced school of decorative art, now best represented by ivory carvings and a few works in other materials".<sup>23</sup> Fritz Schachermeyr discussed at length the various influences of one Late Bronze Age national art on another.<sup>24</sup> Pierre Demargne in the section "The Rise of Composite Civilisations"<sup>25</sup> in *Aegean Art* discussed the international background of the period and against it placed many of the pieces under discussion here. His term for the blend of Mycenaean and Syrian (including original Mesopotamian) elements particularly observable in seals and metalwork, is "Mycenaean Syrian Art".<sup>26</sup> For the Cypriot involvement he desires the terms "Cypro-Mycenaean" or "Levanto-Helladic".<sup>27</sup>

---

22. KANTOR (1956) pp. 166-8, and above p. 192.

23. KANTOR (1960) pp. 24-25.

24. SCHACHERMEYR (1967) pp. 30-64.

25. DEMARGNE (1964) Ch. VII, pp. 243-64.

26. Ibid., pp. 254-64. His seal 361 is the same as Seyrig's "mycenisant" cylinder and his seal 362 has a rather static rendition of the Duel motif. The former I would place as an Aegean cylinder along with 495 and the latter with 179 in the International Style group. Demargue further lists the Ugarit Ivory and the Vaulted Tombs under this term. (See my 518 and 473-4).

27. Ibid. pp. 252-4 and illustrations 345, 347-9. The Enkomi Bowl, his 354, he considers Cypro-Mycenaean or imported Mycenaean, but his 360, the Ugarit Bowl with the hunting scene he labels Syrian art.

While allowing indebtedness to all these writers, this exposition would claim to have approached the problem in a more systematic way in that it has dealt with all the art forms, not simply ivory carving or seals or metalwork, and in that it has coined and explained the use of a series of terms which both categorize the type of artistic interrelation and measure it. The explanations of an International Repertoire, of Intrusive and Incorporated Elements, of National Styles and the International Style, give a more accurate description of the art of this international world of the Late Bronze Age than any proposed before.

## 7 THE INTERNATIONAL STYLE

### The Classification of Individual Pieces

Now that the behaviour of the transferring and migrating motifs has been explained with the help of the terms, International Repertoire, Intrusive and Incorporated Elements, and International Style, it would be an appropriate point to consider an eclectic group of pieces which appear to provide some problems in classification. They are all fine pieces and between them example a variety of materials and techniques, fresco, relief, metalwork, faience, pottery, lapidary work, ivory-carving, glyptic and jewellery. The first six pieces, 504 to 509, are well known and must be included in any discussion on the transference of artistic motifs since they are usually the ones brought forward as evidence for interconnections between the Aegean and eastern lands in the Late Bronze Age. However it seems more correct procedure to establish the artistic connections by other evidence and then to view these controversial pieces against the artistic milieu so delineated.

504. Rock Crystal Bowl from Mycenae - LHI.

The material is usual for the Aegean<sup>1</sup> but the regarant duck head comes from the East where it has been in use in Syrian art for centuries, following the long-established Egyptian style for small bowls and cosmetic spoons. Comparisons are 253 and the cosmetic spoon 206 which has just such a duck's head on the other end.

This piece has been admired since its excavation. Marinatos considers it Aegean, likening its shape to those of the Early Helladic "sauce-boats" and Mochlos stone vases.<sup>2</sup> Higgins would place it in

---

1. MARIN p. 102, where he discusses the piece, and SCHACHERMEYER (1967) Pl. LVI where he illustrates the bowl beside the Alalakh ivory.

2. MARIN p. 102.

the long tradition of Cretan lapidary work pointing out that "the Cretan artist who carved it has transformed a basically Egyptian motive into something characteristically Cretan".<sup>3</sup> Warren allows that it could be an Egyptian import but rules out Mycenaean manufacture at this early stage. On balance he considers it probably Minoan.<sup>4</sup> In general agreement with these writers, and against the background interconnections in ancient art, this piece can be classified as an example of a foreign motif assimilated into Aegean art to the level of the Incorporated Element. The Minoan artist has taken the Egyptian and Syrian motif of the regarant duck's head and the Aegean bowl shape and material and has created a beautiful piece worthy of the admiration so often bestowed on it.

505. Niello Dagger from Mycenae - LHI.  
 From Circle A, this dagger with its Nilotic Scene has long been thought as showing Egyptian connections.<sup>5</sup> An example of the Egyptian hunting scene in the Nile marshes, with the Cat catching Wildfowl motif is given in 421.

If all the elements are indeed originally Egyptian then most have been substantially changed. In the dagger scene the papyrus plants have lost their stiffness and have become wavy clusters like the foliate clumps in the International Style scenes. The cat still catches birds with claw and mouth but does not sit on a papyrus frond to do so. Rather he seizes them in mid-leap, betraying the Aegean love of active animal poses which is even more clearly seen in the pose of the other cat which, in full Flying Gallop, chases another bird.<sup>6</sup> The fish are depicted in the Egyptian manner fully revealed

---

3. HIGGINS (1967) p. 162.

4. WARREN (1969a) p. 104. He notes the particular Egyptian element of the duck's head reversed.

5. DICKINSON (1977) pp. 82-3 gives the most recent summary of the problems associated with Aegean inlay and "Metallmalerei".

6. MARIN XXXV for the full scene.



in the water but the stream is not handled as an Egyptian stream which resolutely flows across the bottom of all such scenes. This one meanders through the landscape, composed by the Mountain View Perspective which is Aegean.<sup>7</sup> Now if papyrus did grow in the Aegean<sup>8</sup> in Bronze Age times then the landscape on this dagger may simply be the Aegean presentation of its own Cretan streams fringed by papyrus clumps and not the imperfect rendering of the vast papyrus marshes of the Nile which would be so hard for any one but an Egyptian to comprehend. A landscape similar to this one is seen on the Theran fresco 114 which also invites other comparisons in the theme of animals chasing birds<sup>9</sup> and the spotted skin markings of the cat. The assessment of the piece must be that the originally Egyptian motif of the cat hunting bird in a papyrus thicket has been fully assimilated into Aegean art to the Incorporated Element level. The process seems to have been a complicated one since the motifs, originally Egyptian, have had to migrate by way of Syria and Crete or Thera to acquire all their iconographical details. Two additional details seem to point to the passage via Syria and not direct, and via Thera rather than Crete. The niello technique has its home in 18th century Syria<sup>10</sup> and some additional iconographical features that are now available from the Theran frescoes suggest that Theran artists, if they are not simply Minoans living abroad or completely Minoanized islanders,<sup>11</sup> greatly

---

7. See above pp. 142, 154.

8. See above Chapter 2, Papyrus, p. 76.

9. THERA VICP 8. Though not catching them in the pieces that remain to us.

10. A dagger and a scimitar in Byblos Tombs. The dagger is illustrated in HIGGINS (1967) p. 140 where he also discusses the technique. A section of the scimitar design is illustrated in 247.

11. IMMERWAHR (1977) finds many iconographical details in the West House frescoes which are not purely Minoan, but are possibly Mycenaean. See particularly pp. 178-83.

influenced the style. The additional iconographical details concern the emblems painted on the sides of two ships from the ship fresco.<sup>12</sup> The running lions on the flagship parallel the running lions on the Mycenae dagger, 384, even to the "clouds above".<sup>13</sup> On the same ship, as well as in the sea around, dolphins leaping in upward and downward curves provide parallels for the dolphins on each side of the Prosymna dagger.<sup>14</sup> On another ship the row of doves flying below clouds finds an almost exact parallel in the other Prosymna dagger.<sup>15</sup> There are enough lilies on Thera pottery to provide prototypes for the Mycenae lily dagger<sup>16</sup> and the seascape of the Pylos dagger<sup>17</sup> can now be compared to the little table in the Marine Style found in the 1970 season.<sup>18</sup> Now many of these motifs can be found in Crete and the Thera examples are Minoanized to an extreme degree so the avenue of transference could still be Crete.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless the co-incidence of iconographical detail in the handling of motifs on the daggers and in the newly found Thera frescoes makes the proposal of a Thera origin for the niello dagger designs an extremely attractive one.

The only possible classification for such a rich piece with debatable

---

12. THERA VI CP 9.

13. MARIN XXXV.

14. BLEGEN (1937) p. 331 discusses the pieces. Note the Mycenaean restraint of the "Ephyraean Style" commented on by HIGGINS (1967) p. 141.

15. BLEGEN (1937) Pl. II and pp. 331-2. Found in an LHII context the piece is much damaged and therefore not often illustrated but the design is clearly comparable to the Thera emblem except that the Prosymna birds wear a collar. I am not sure of the Thera birds. In a similar design on a fresco at Pylos 382, the birds do not, apparently, have collars, but the fresco is very damaged. The flying birds on the Dendra bowl 379 should also be compared along with those on the dagger VERM Pl. XIII D.

16. MARIN 170.

17. Ibid., 171.

18. THERA IV Back Cover.

19. The facts that no niello pieces have been found in Crete and one blade is reported to have come from Thera should not weigh too heavily against Crete being the intermediary. See again DICKINSON (1977) pp. 82-3.

origin whose design carries such a blend of motifs is to make it the earliest example of the Ornate International Style.

506. Minoan Pendant from the Aegina Treasure - 17th-16th C.<sup>20</sup>  
 Master of Animals:  
 Two Birds close addorsed about a Hero in kilt and feathered(?) headdress<sup>21</sup> who subdues them at neck.  
 A Snake Frame supporting the Birds<sup>22</sup> and the whole subtended by a bar with three lotus flowers upstanding.  
 Five gold disks pendant.

Evans in the first publication of the piece had elements correct when he called the piece a "Mykenaeen jewel..."<sup>23</sup> and allowed that "although the original elements are all Egyptian ... the whole has as it were been recast in a more Oriental mould".<sup>24</sup> Higgins calls the figure a "Minoan 'Master of Animals'"<sup>25</sup> but would change some of Evans' details. He makes the Hathor hair style into circular earrings<sup>26</sup> and instead of Evans' skirt and girdle, he describes the clothing as "a tightly fitting tunic, shorts, and a tight belt with an embroidered end hanging down in front".<sup>27</sup> The description of "shorts" however must be incorrect. The length and shape of the garment seems more consonant with the Aegean kilt known from later

- 
20. Higgins' identification and date, HIGGINS (1957) pp. 43-6. See also his important comparisons with other jewellery pp. 28-9. HOPKINS (1962) has not taken these comparisons into account, though he mentions the Higgins article, and consequently his date of 7th century is not acceptable.
21. Is there another link with Mari in the matter of feathered head-dresses? One of the attendant animals in the Investiture Fresco, PARROT (1958) Pl. A, has just such a headdress.
22. The role of supporting the other emblems is a role repeated in the later Mainland signet, 57.
23. EVANS (1892-3) p. 199.
24. Ibid., p. 120.
25. HIGGINS (1957) p. 46 and HIGGINS (1967) p. 49.
26. The earrings worn by the figure find parallels in the large circular earrings worn by women in the Thera frescoes, THERA VIII Pls. 58, 60-2, and the ornate circular earrings from the Shaft Graves, 238.
27. HIGGINS (1957) p. 47.

Minoan frescoes and Egyptian wall paintings. Indeed with kilt, tunic, and tall feathered headdress the Hero would be dressed exactly as the man with the axe in the Enkomi Box 367 and the same as some of the Sea People warriors in the Ramesses III battle scenes, 464.<sup>28</sup> Only the earrings are missing and they would be inappropriate to the panoply of war. This piece must be classified as an example showing eastern motifs taken over and assimilated into Aegean art to the Incorporated Element level.

507. Carved Ivory Lid from Ugarit - 13th C.  
The two Mesopotamian motifs, the Antithetical Group and Mistress of Animals have been fused with the Aegean elements of the woman's Minoan garb and pose and the Aegean altar to form an integrated design.

The identification of the original home of each of the motifs is the easiest part of the iconographical discussion here. Frankfort noted the non-Aegean element of the Goddess feeding the animals.<sup>29</sup> Kantor in her assessment of the composition compared the piece to many Mycenaean ivories but finally deemed it "Asiatic work closely imitating Mycenaean convention".<sup>30</sup> However now that almost the exact hair style has appeared in the Aegean in an earlier Thera Fresco<sup>31</sup> it is possible to weight the Aegean comparisons more heavily and to incline to Demargne's assessment of a Mycenaean origin.<sup>32</sup> Still the Syrian cast

- 
28. See extended versions in SMITH IN Figs. 220-1 where the costume details are clearer, and NELSON (1943) who deals with the Sea Battle scene in depth. The warriors with the feathered head-dresses are probably Peleset, the most numerous of the invaders, SMITH IN p. 180 and Fig. 221, and illustrated here 464.
29. FRANK AA p. 155. A good discussion noting Aegean and eastern elements.
30. KANTOR (1960) pp. 23-4 where she illustrates many of the Mycenaean comparisons. Her earlier article listed the piece in the "Extreme Mycenaeanizing" style, KANTOR (1956) p. 168. See above p. 204.
31. THERA VII Pl. 60.
32. DEMARGNE (1964) p. 259.

to the "feeding the goats" section argues for familiarity with eastern themes. Since there is such a fusion of motifs and since there is such doubt about allocating the source of the manufacture the ivory should be placed among the examples of the International Style, possibly the Severe Style because of clarity of the design and lack of extraneous detail.<sup>33</sup>

508. The Hagia Triada Sarcophagus - LMIIIA.<sup>34</sup>  
 The designs are still Minoan in style with a certain "stiffness".  
 The section illustrated here is one of the long side panels, the scene where Three Men bring offerings(?) to a Male Figure standing(?) before a Building.

In short the design is simple to describe yet it is the one which has caused most discussion of all the scenes on the sarcophagus. Nilsson<sup>35</sup> and Marinatos<sup>36</sup> would allow it to represent the dead man outside his tomb receiving gifts for the afterlife as in Egyptian tomb paintings. Nauert in a recent article presents a persuasive argument for seeing the sarcophagus panels as the portrayal of the worship of a vegetation god.<sup>37</sup> Long argues against this proposal and against earlier proposals of the figure being that of a deified hero, for she considers the figure that of the spirit of the deceased watching his funeral rites and already beginning to sink beneath the ground.<sup>38</sup> However the iconographical detail does present a case for

33. Above pp. 201-3.

34. For a full discussion of the sarcophagus, its 14th century date, find place, and iconography see the recent study, LONG (1974).

35. NILSSON (1950) pp. 426-43.

36. MARIN pp. 40, 151-2.

37. NAUERT (1965). This argument to some extent relies on the details revealed by the cleaning of the sarcophagus. In the panels each end are women in chariots pulled by Griffins and agrimi.

38. LONG (1974) pp. 80-2.

an Egyptian connection. It is not the case for the scene being the Egyptian ceremony of the "Opening of the Mouth" performed for an Egyptian expatriate who had died in Crete, which Long has adequately discounted.<sup>39</sup> It is the case for a Cretan adaptation of a characteristic Egyptian composition in the 14th century which has already been shown as a time of considerable international exchange in artistic motifs. In Egyptian art the portrayal of the owner of the tomb, in mummified form outside at the tomb entrance, is always one of the subjects of the tomb wall paintings as in 431B. It would seem possible that at this time a regular Egyptian tomb element had been transposed on to the Cretan sarcophagus with modifications to the tomb shape and the owner's garb. The points that the figure is quite static and is depicted "armless" as is the original mummiform shape have not received the attention from authors that they deserve. Long has recognized their importance but after a full discussion which allows a "superficial resemblance" to Egyptian compositions<sup>40</sup> she decides against the Egyptian connection on the grounds that several of the details of Egyptian iconography are missing, in particular the characteristic mummy bands.<sup>41</sup> These details are missing but it is also true that some of those details are not always shown on Egyptian examples<sup>42</sup> and that many Egyptian representations do not manifest the mummy bands as clearly as the example illustrated by Long.<sup>43</sup> It is

---

39. Ibid pp. 44-6.

40. Ibid p. 45.

41. Ibid pp. 45, 78-79.

42. There is no support by pole or person in SAVE-SODERBERGH (1956) Tomb of Nebamun Pl. XXVI, or in DAVIES (1948) Tomb of Khons Pl. XVI.

43. LONG (1974) Fig. 63.  
The mummy bands cannot be distinguished easily in the richly bedecked forms in DAVIES (1948) Tomb of Khons Pl. XVI, and are not pronounced on the figure in the Tomb of Nakhtamun Pl. XXVI.

the static pose as well as "armless" condition of the Egyptian deceased which is the dominant characteristic and that is what the Minoan figure shares. This, together with the overall composition of porters bringing tribute to a deceased outside his tomb, is what points to the piece being a Cretan adaptation of an Egyptian motif to the Incorporated Element level. This is not to say that the same beliefs underlie the parallel iconographical details but merely to consider it as an example of artistic transference at a time when it is known the Aegean borrowed from eastern traditions.

509. Silver Bowl from Enkomi - 14th C.<sup>44</sup>

This bowl and its twin from Dendra are Cypriot in form and show the floral motifs of Papyrus and Rosette from the International Repertoire. The Rosettes are in the Aegean form of the double Rosette and are placed inside an Aegean Arcade Pattern which itself forms a Rosette at the base, an ancient design.<sup>45</sup> The Papyrus florets and Bulls' Heads with unusual down-curving horns are precisely but effectively arranged above the base pattern.

When trying to give an assessment of the piece against the international artistic milieu in the Late Bronze Age, Higgins' description is helpful. "The cup is a traditional Cypriot shape, but the choice of motive and its treatment are typically Mycenaean, suggesting that it was made in Greece expressly for the Cypriot market".<sup>46</sup> Such a fusion of elements explains why this piece and its Dendra twin have already been listed among the examples of the International Style.<sup>47</sup> It belongs to that restrained type of composition, the Severe Style, which originates in Mycenaean predilection for economy of design.

---

44. The pottery from the tomb containing this bowl included LHIIIA<sub>2</sub>, BRII and WSII.

45. As on the base of the gold cup from a Warrior Grave near Knossos, HOOD (1956) Pl. 13.

46. HIGGINS (1967) p. 151.

47. See above pp. 196-7.

These six famous pieces can now be seen in their correct perspective as examples of certain levels of motif transference and acceptance in the Late Bronze Age. They no longer require that exceptional position given them by so many writers except in so far as they are indeed fine rich examples of internationalism in ancient art.

The next six pieces, 510 to 515, are all relatively recent finds and each shows some interesting aspect of the artistic inter-connections.

510. Fragment of a Cycladic Jar from Kea - LMIA/LHI.  
Crested Griffin or Cycladic bird.  
Caskey has no doubt it is a Griffin<sup>48</sup> but the published fragments do not completely substantiate this identification and birds are a regular motif on Cycladic pottery.<sup>49</sup> If this is an early example of the migrating Griffin motif, it can be compared with the details in later examples, 123 to 128, 482. Except for the eye it is similar to the Griffin from the Pylos Throne Room 128.<sup>50</sup>
511. Ivory Pyxis from Thebes.<sup>51</sup>  
The design illustrates many migrating motifs.  
Mirror Reverse:  
Two Sphinxes statant elevated.  
The Plumed Hat and Marbling on the border above are Aegean motifs. The flat topped hat is seen again on the head from Puthios found in 1972. Presumably the head of a Sphinx, it parallels the finds from Asine and Mycenae.<sup>52</sup>

- 
48. CATLING (1975) p. 21, quotation from Caskey's report on the Kea Excavations. "Fragments of a handsome big jar were found in a stratum of the time of LMIA/LHI in House A. The fabric is Cycladic; the surface buff. On our fragment are parts of a splendid Griffin moving to the right, crested head raised, great wing extended upward to the left, tail curving in a spiral. Head, body and pinions are red, the outlines and details are black, all in matt paint. The conception is monumental, making one think of wall painting".
49. Above p. 50, F.N. 12.
50. The eye of the Griffin at Pylos is rounded to the beak and pointed to the neck, PN II pp. 110-1.
51. FRASER (1971) Fig. 26, pp. 14-15.  
The pyxis was found in a tomb where the walls were decorated with frescoes, the first to be found in a Mycenaean tomb.
52. Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον 1970 A (1972) Pls. 58-9.



512. Ivory Plaque from Thebes - LHIII B.<sup>53</sup>  
 The migrating Minoan Genius.<sup>54</sup>  
 The "procession" is broken by Palm motifs of Mycenaean style in the intervals between each figure. The Palm motif in the Pylos sealing 183 and the pottery designs 184 is treated in the same way. Minoan Demons wear just such a Palm on the steatite mould from Mycenae found 1967.<sup>55</sup>
513. Ivory Plaque from Thebes - LHIII B.  
 This piece shows the sure hand of the Mycenaean ivory carver in handling the tight heraldic design and the strong taut limbs of the animals<sup>56</sup> as with the Griffins in examples 484 to 486.  
 The ivory carver is however using the agrimi in Heraldic Poses from the International Repertoire. Compare the agrimi rampant in saltire on the Ugarit bowl 511.  
 This fine piece should be included among the examples of the Severe International Style.<sup>57</sup>
514. Ivory Inlay from Kition - 13th C.  
 Lion in the Flying Gallop.<sup>58</sup>  
 The Delos plaque 130 shows a similar treatment. Also from the same deposit comes an ivory plaque of Bes,<sup>59</sup> more finely-carved than the Megiddo example.<sup>60</sup>  
 The piece may be a Mycenaean import or may represent the local acceptance of the Aegean Flying Gallop.
515. Bronze Statuette from Melos - 13th C.  
 Smiting Figure type.<sup>61</sup>  
 This must be an import from the East representing the case where the motif was not accepted into Aegean art.

The first four examples, 510 to 513, give additional examples of the migration of motifs and the assimilation into Aegean art of the Heraldic Poses, Antithetical Group, Mirror Reverse, Griffin, Sphinx,

- 
53. Found along with the next example 513 in the 1964-5 season and published fully in SYMEONOGLOU (1973).
54. Note the quarry held over his shoulder. See the discussion on the motif p. 63.
55. MEGAW (1967) Fig. 13, p. 9. From the LHIII B level comes "a brick-shaped block of steatite deeply carved on all four principal faces with characteristic Mycenaean motifs for moulding glass beads and embossing gold leaf".
56. A Mycenaean characteristic, above p. 54.
57. Above pp. 200-3.
58. CATLING (1975) Fig. 33 p. 19. Another Flying Gallop from fresco fragments found in an LHIII B building at Orchomenos in 1975. The fresco appears to be a boar hunt similar to the Tiryns one.
59. KARAGEORGHIS (1976a) Fig. 76 and p. 880.
60. LOUD (1939) Pl. 8.
61. COLLON (1972) gives a full discussion of the Smiting God, listing the examples found in the Aegean and the East.

Thoueris into the Minoan Genius. The ivory 514 is an example where the foreign motif is accepted while the bronze statuette represents the case where the motif is rejected by the indigenous art.

The implications of the last four examples, 517 to 520, for the theory of motif transference are rather more difficult to define.

516. Signet Ring from Kouklia - c1200.<sup>62</sup>

517. Detail of the Seal design.

Two Bulls couchant back to back.

The form is purely Egyptian, the design purely Mycenaean, and both are Intrusive Elements in the Cyprus artistic sphere.

This is a composite piece, an "international piece" but not in the International Style since it represents simply the artistic union of two national elements. There are several such rings in existence.<sup>63</sup> An earlier work, the dagger of Amosis, is just such an international piece in that the Asiatic shape is adorned with a finely-wrought cartouche of the Pharaoh.<sup>64</sup> The weapons of his wife Ah-hotpe carry more extensive designs which show Aegean Intrusive Elements.<sup>65</sup>

518. Cypriot Cylinder Seal - 14th C.<sup>66</sup>

The form is Mesopotamian and the motifs are widely eclectic but they are all Cypriot assimilated to the Incorporated Element level. A similar case is the cylinder from Ugarit where the multitude of designs has been blended into a Cypriot Seal Style.<sup>67</sup>

---

62. The date listed is the date for the tomb given by BOARDMAN (1970a) p. 65. An earlier stylistic date of 15th to 14th centuries would be in accord with the composition.

KENNA (1968) in discussing the ring gives Minoan and Mycenaean comparisons pp. 158, 160. Other comparisons are CMS I 109, 142, 183, 197, 240, and a new example from the Sellopoulo tombs, POPHAM (1974) Pl. 38, c, f.

63. BOARDMAN (1970b) pp. 5-7 discusses the shape and designs of Bronze Age metal signet rings in Cyprus and gives a useful catalogue.

64. NEEDLER (1962).

65. For Ah-hotpe's axe with the Griffin see SMITH AA Pl. 86; for the niello dagger with animals in the Flying Gallop see SMITH IN Fig. 37, p. 29.

66. KENNA (1967) pp. 251-4.

67. BUCHANAN (1968) Fig. 1, p. 410.

This is a national cylinder seal style to parallel the Aegean cylinders already discussed. There would appear to be three types of cylinder seal in Cyprus apart from direct imports from the East. Firstly there are those where the designs are predominantly Near-Eastern in content and are thus Cypriot copies of eastern motifs. Secondly there are those of a distinctly Aegean character where the motifs can be identified in Minoan and Mycenaean art. Thirdly we find those seals like 518 where the eclectic character of the designs is blended by Cypriot taste with Cypriot elements like the script.<sup>68</sup>

519. Faience Rhyton from Abydos - Dyn. XVIII.<sup>69</sup>  
The shape is originally Aegean, as is the running Spiral. It appears to be a copy of Aegean types, the whole piece being an "Intrusive Element" in eastern art. It is to be compared with the rhyton from Mycenae,<sup>70</sup> to the rhyton from Pylos<sup>71</sup> and the three newly found at Ugarit,<sup>72</sup> to the rhyton in the British Museum also a copy like 519,<sup>73</sup> and the Cyprus rhyton in the International Style of 326.

It would be difficult to ascribe a place of origin to this particular piece but the faience rhytons found at such widely separated sites do give an indication of the complexity of inter-connections at this time.<sup>74</sup>

---

68. PORADA (1948b) gives a full discussion of the first two types with examples listed. KENNA (1967) expands the description of Cypriot Cylinder Seal style and also explains the affinities of seal designs with Aegean glyptic.

69. NELSON (1936) pp. 501-6.

70. WACE (1953) Pl. 11b.

71. BLEGEN (1973) Pl. 249, 26.

72. DE CONTENSON (1974) Pl. 2 a, b, c.

73. NELSON (1936) Fig. 2.

74. See below p. 229 for a discussion of the dispersal of polychrome glazing techniques.

## 520. Relief from Alaca Huyuk - 14th-13th C.

Double-headed Eagle grasping Hares.

This example shows a mark down the centre which may suggest two bodies but the more regular usage is shown by the earlier Hittite seal 263 and the contemporary Yazilikaya relief 433 which clearly reveal the single body.

The motif is established by middle Hittite times on stamp seal designs and is regularly used till the end of the Hittite period. It should not be confused with the Mesopotamian Imdugud which has a lion's head garlanded, nor with the Egyptian Horus falcon or Nekhbet vulture which have the single head 13.

It is possible that a composition such as this may have provided inspiration for the double eagle necklet from the Shaft Graves.<sup>75</sup> An Aegean artist unfamiliar with the Hittite motif who was asked to render the Double-headed Eagle for the first time may well in his ignorance have interpreted the two heads as indicating two birds and thus supplied two tails. This example is included because it represents pieces which may indicate motif sharing but where the migration cannot be traced so clearly as with the major motifs of Chapter 2. Sometimes the link is suggested by the theme in the two pieces compared, sometimes it is no more than a nuance in the rendering of the later piece that calls to mind the original motif. The following nine motifs may also represent faint indications of motif transference.

The theme of the "King in the embrace of the Gods" is a standard means of portraying the special relationship between Pharaoh and Egyptian deities but Hittite kings of the Empire Period are also shown encircled by the arm of a protecting god.<sup>76</sup>

The theme of the "Goddess suckling the Prince" is again a standard depiction of the young Pharaoh but also used at Ugarit.<sup>77</sup>

---

75. KARO Pl. LXVI, 689 and MARIN 205.

76. MICH 304, 365 and AKUR 85.

77. MICH 515 and CULICAN (1966) 59.

There is a "starry ceiling" at Mari, in Egyptian tombs and temples, on a Thera fresco and the Tiryns signet.<sup>78</sup>

A large perching, hovering, or alighting bird features in the Mari Investiture fresco, on the Hagia Triada Sarcophagus, in the Banquet Fresco at Pylos and in Shaft Graves gold work.<sup>79</sup>

There are splendid butterflies in Egyptian painting, Minoan frescoes and Mycenaean gold work.<sup>80</sup>

The "Somersaulting Acrobat" is found in Egyptian paintings, on the Mallia sword pommel, and on Aegean seals.<sup>81</sup>

Animal or bird's heads holding dagger blades are found in the Yazilikaya reliefs, in Ugarit metalwork and in a Shaft Graves weapon.<sup>82</sup>

The "Quartered Circle" composition can be traced in Aegean seal designs from Early Minoan pieces. It is found again on the Saqqara box which carries other Aegean motifs and on an ivory at Megiddo.<sup>83</sup>

The "circular movement" in artistic composition where the design seems to race round the circumference of a circle begins with the whirling designs of Samarra pottery, is found again in the Mari plates and later gives the brilliant examples of the Shaft Graves metal work.<sup>84</sup>

---

78. PARROT (1958) Pl. E, MICH 559 and discussed on p. 289, THERA V CP G. The Tiryns Signet is illustrated, 143.

79. PARROT (1958) Pl. A, MARIN Pls. XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, PN II Pls. 126, A, and MARIN 205.

80. MICH 96, 431, PM II Pl. XIV, Fig. 514, MARIN 202 and KARO Pls. XXVI, XXVII.

81. MICH 754, MARIN 69, KENNA (1960) 204. An Aegean example is illustrated, 44.

82. AKUR 83, SCHAEFFER (1939) Fig. 107. The Weapon from the Shaft Graves is illustrated, 248.

83. CMS II.1 4, 22, 33, 36, 43, 47, 56, 74, 96, SCHACHERMEYR (1967) 182 and 181.

84. PARR 60, PARROT (1959) Pl. XVII, KARO Pls. LXXVII, LXXVIII.

The signet ring, the cylinder seal, and the faience rhyton have revealed other aspects of artistic interconnections but the Hittite relief and the list of nine motifs following it are in a rather more tenuous category. There is not enough precision in the iconographical details of these last ten motifs, nor are there enough examples, to allow the tracing of a possible transference as was done with the major motifs in Chapter 2. These motifs must await discussion until further excavations provide more evidence for their assessment.

## 8 MEANS OF TRANSFERENCE

### The Direct Import

The simplest way for motifs to transfer is through the importation of a foreign piece which has worked on it the foreign motif. This method has the virtue of providing right in the adoptive country, right in the hand of the adopting craftsman, an accurate rendition of the original motif for copying. The presence of this foreign piece in the new land does not ensure that the motif will be adopted, nor does the clear statement of the motif in its indigenous style ensure that when a copy is made it will be accurate. In Chapter 5 some direct imports carrying designs were discussed in the enquiry into the timing and avenue of the motif transference.<sup>1</sup> Others include Egyptian statues and statuettes of apes and Sphinxes, and gold work, jewellery, and scarabs found in Syria and Palestine<sup>2</sup> and the smaller items like scarabs and amulets found further afield including the Aegean area.<sup>3</sup> Mesopotamian cylinder seals are found widely dispersed.<sup>4</sup> Syrian cylinder seals go to Cyprus,<sup>5</sup> and Minoan and Mycenaean

---

1. Above pp. 171-9.

2. For the period before c1900 see EDWARDS (1971) pp. 45-6, DROWER (1971) p. 345.

TUFNELL and WARD (1966) discuss the scarabs in the Montet Jar and connections to Mesopotamia and the Aegean, pp. 220-8.

For the c1900 to c1700 period see the discussion on the Royal Tombs at Byblos CULLICAN (1966) pp. 19-26, and Sphinxes in Syria SMITH IN p. 15 and Fig. 25.

3. PENDLEBURY (1930) lists Egyptian finds in the Aegean.

Of the fifteen seals in true scarab shape illustrated in CMS II.1 with Pre-Palatial seals, Platon lists only three as Egyptian scarabs, 120, 283, 434.

Other recently found imports include a scarab of Amenophis III found in Tomb 4 at Sellopoulo POPHAM (1974) pp. 216-7, and the scarab of Horemheb found at Knossos CATLING (1975) Fig. 50, pp. 26-7.

4. MALLOWAN (1971) pp. 241, FRANKFORT (1971) pp. 89-90, FRANK CS p. 227, DROWER (1971) p. 345.

5. PORADA (1948). PORADA (1973) p. 272 lists the few imported cylinder seals known in Cyprus before c1550.

pottery and metalwork goes to Cyprus, the Levantine ports, and Egypt.<sup>6</sup> One would wish a full compilation of all imported pieces carrying motifs found in excavated sites in the Aegean and the East but this briefest of surveys at least points to the possibility of motif transference via the direct import.

In the Aegean a great many eastern motifs including every migrating one can be found on known imported items. There is the Egyptian scarab from Platanos, 135, which carries the Thoueris motif. Evans lists four cylinder seals from Crete and the Mainland, two in the old Babylonian style from Platanos and Iraklion, another of an earlier style from Knossos, and a "Syro-Hittite" one from Athens.<sup>7</sup> They show designs of deities in Horned Helmets, a Nude Hero, Disk in Crescent, and an Ishtar-like figure with foot on a Scale Mountain, Sphinx, Dragon, and the couchant, rampant, in saltire, and inverted poses. The most interesting of the many Mainland finds are illustrated in 521 to 526, the last two being two seals from the cache of thirty-six lapis lazuli cylinder seals found at Thebes.

521. Bronze Figurine found at Tiryns - c14th C.  
This Reshef statuette shows the characteristic Weather God in the pose of the Smiting Figure. Though several of these bronzes were known in the Aegean area, the motif was not adopted.<sup>8</sup>

- 
6. STUBBINGS (1951a) and CADOGAN (1973). See also additional references below p. 232, F.N. 12.  
CATLING and KARAGEORGHIS (1960) give a list of Minoan finds in Cyprus.
7. PM I Fig. 146, PM II Fig. 158, PM IV Figs. 350, 339.
8. See above Chapter 3, Smiting Figure and illustration 515, a recent find from Melos. CANBY (1971) treats the problem of the figurines most sensibly, allowing them to be imports, with this one from Tiryns and another from Thessaly to come from Hittite areas. The full discussion by COLLON (1972) has been noted above p. 216, F.N. 61.



522. Carved Ivory Tusk found at Mycenae - LHII-III B context.<sup>9</sup>  
The Antithetical Group is used to portray the Animals at the Tree of Life and Master of Animals themes overlapping as in the seal 526. The animals are goats couchant averted and the tree, illustrated here, is a composite affair of Palmettes. Upper Egyptian plants, and lotus flowers. The male figure moves to the right and wears a collar and bracelet. The bird is depicted like an Egyptian falcon, wings displayed.
523. Cylinder Seal found at Tiryns - Mitannian.  
The motifs included in this seal design are the Heraldic Pose couchant, Antithetical Group, Bull Man gardant, Griffin, Sacred Tree as a Palmette Tree, Rosette, drilled Guilloche, and Winged Sun Disk supported by the Pillar of Heaven.<sup>10</sup>
524. Cylinder Seal found at Perati - Mitannian.<sup>11</sup>  
In this seal Antithetical Group is used for the Master of Animals motif twice. The first is a Winged Hero subduing at leg a Dragon(?) inverted. The second shows the variation of two figures with the animal between and they do duty as the supporters of the Winged Sun Disk.  
A statant Lion, Bull with lowered horn, Goat couchant regardant, Rosette, Star, Hathor Head, Animal Head, and Scroll Pattern complete the design.
525. Cylinder Seal found at Thebes - Babylonian.<sup>12</sup>  
The Antithetical Group renders the Mistress of Animals subduing at leg two animals inverted above a group in Mirror Reverse, two Griffins sejant regardant elevated. A Winged Sun Disk protects a Sphinx rampant at a Seated Deity with Horned Helmet.  
Ankh below the throne.

- 
9. POURSAT (1977b) pp. 94-5, Pls. XXX, XXXI for a full description of the piece. The date given is that for the Chamber Tombs excavated by Tsountas.  
POURSAT (1977a) p. 231, in his discussion of foreign influences on the Mycenaean Ivory Style considers this piece an import of Syrian manufacture.
10. See above Chapters 2 and 3 and FRANK CS pp. 274-8.  
Frankfort illustrates this seal as an example of the Mitannian style FRANK CS Pl. XLII O. Another Mitannian faience cylinder was found in an LHIII B context at Mycenae, PORADA (1957).
11. IAKOVIDES (1969) p. 457, Pl. 47.  
The seal is Mitannian of probably 15th century date.
12. Both 525 and 526 were found at Thebes in an LHIII B context.  
See the illustrations and brief discussions of the Theban cache in PLATON (1964), PORADA (1965), and TOULOUPIA (1965). PORADA (1965) p. 173, "The engraved lapis lazuli cylinders belong to several stylistic groups: Early Mesopotamian (Early Dynastic III to Old Babylonian, c2500-1600 BC): Kassite, made in Babylonia during the fourteenth century, or slightly earlier in the fifteenth century; Mitannian cylinders from North Mesopotamia and North Syria of a similar date; one Hittite cylinder, also of similar date; and several examples of Aegean styles.

526. Cylinder Seal found at Thebes. - Kassite.

The design is based on the Antithetical Group with overlapping motifs. The Goats rampant function in two roles; they are the attendants to the Master of Animals, a Nude Hero who subdues them at horn and they also stand about at the Sacred Tree averted, as Animals at the Tree of Life. Rosettes and Lozenges also feature.

Most of these items come from the Mainland from levels at the end of the era but they were made earlier, between 25th and 14th centuries, and it is possible that they came to Greece soon after their manufacture and remained as "heirlooms" to be buried at a later date.<sup>13</sup>

One other set of imports should be considered here, though being perishable, they are not available for investigation now. These are the fabrics,<sup>14</sup> patterned in the weave, perhaps embroidered as well. Some indication of the value of cloth as a trade commodity is given by the Egyptian wall paintings that show lengths of material as tribute along side rich metal goods.<sup>15</sup> Imported fabric may well be another means of transferring motifs.

---

13. Above, *Introduction* p. 7.

14. Perhaps also leatherwork.

15. Also by the attention paid in texts to arrangements for wool, weaving linen, below p. 236.

## 8 MEANS OF TRANSFERENCE

### The Skill of the Craftsman

The travelling craftsman wherever he goes has in his mind the knowledge of his own artistic tradition and its motifs, and in his hands the skill of working these motifs in metal or ivory, on gems or in frescoes. This produces a particularly accurate transmission of the motif since no mistakes can result from the artist's imperfect understanding of the motif and its original tradition. The initial transference would occur when an artist moved to a new area and began work and the new motifs would become consolidated in the adoptive artistic tradition when local artists were trained by the foreign craftsman. This transference of motifs may well be accompanied by a transference of technological skills.

Relatively little is known about the training of the craftsman and whether there were guilds or similar associations with considerable social and economic power as in later periods of history. The Mari Archives record many crafts, apprenticeship training, and the dispatch of trained personnel of local and foreign origin to cities where their skill was in demand, and the situation at Ugarit appears to have been similar.<sup>1</sup> Egyptian wall paintings show different craftsmen at work and texts tell how such men were valued because of their skills.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. SASSON (1968). A most important article on the mobility of Mari artisans. He concludes, p. 54, "Although only the documents from Mari have been consulted, there is little doubt that those of other Ancient Near Eastern societies, when examined, would reveal similar institutions. On a wider scale, such diffusion of artisans must have helped to create an atmosphere in which foreign practices, ideas, and traditions were able to find easier acceptance." For the Ugaritic guilds see GORDON (1956) pp. 137-43, and DROWER (1973) pp. 500-2.
  2. MICH 18, 118, 225, 394 for craftsmen at work, and on the appreciation of fine work note the assessment of W.S. Smith in SMITH OK, outlined above in the *Introduction*. The review of some phases of this book, WILSON (1947), also has much to say on the standing and skill of the Egyptian artist.

Hittite kings valued the work of Babylonian sculptors enough to request their secondment from the Kassite court.<sup>3</sup> The secrets of the jeweller's craft may have been among the most coveted but even here there are indications of interconnections from the earliest times.<sup>4</sup> Sandars has shown that Aegean swords owe much to Levantine metal working skills with the sword of Type B showing particularly close connections between Mycenae of the Shaft Graves and Syria.<sup>5</sup> The existence of travelling tinkers is proved by the finds in the ship wrecked off Cape Gelidonya<sup>6</sup> and stylistic traits have revealed individual Mycenaean vase-painters,<sup>7</sup> and seal-cutters.<sup>8</sup> In the Aegean area palace finds indicate a considerable degree of craft specialization. Within the palace precincts rooms were apparently put aside for manufacturing goods. The Lapidary's Workshop at Knossos<sup>9</sup> and the more recently

- 
3. Hattushilish III asked the young Kassite King Kadashmanenlil to send him a Babylonian sculptor, as the boy's father had done some years before, SMITH IN p. 31.
  4. BASS (1970) considers that the similarity in gold jewellery and vessels over a wide area - Ur, Maikop, Alaca Huyuk, Troy, Thyreatis, and Mochlos - constitute "fresh evidence for the Age of International Trade during the middle of the third millennium B.C.", p. 339. DAVARAS (1975) p. 109 in discussing the Mochlos jewellery allows its ancestry to be traced back to Mesopotamia. In this he follows HIGGINS (1961) p. 57. The earlier article MELLINK (1956) discusses more generally the links between the Alaca Huyuk tombs and the Aegean world.
  5. SANDARS (1961), (1963) gives a full coverage of the Aegean sword, its origins and later dispersal. For a summary of the origins of the Cretan Type A sword see (1961) pp. 21-2 and for the Mainland Type B see (1971) pp. 24-5.
  - o. BASS (1961). This evidence belongs to the very end of the era.
  7. IMMERWAHR (1956) has a "Protome Painter" and contemporary artists. Earlier STUBBINGS (1951) had identified the work of seven different painters. BENSON (1961) reviews the scholarship on the subject, discussing in all thirteen painters.
  8. BETTS (1976) looks at two groups of craftsmen, a Cretan of LMIIIA and a Mainland of LHIIIA-B.
  9. WARREN (1967). He lists also at Knossos a sculptor's workshop in the Domestic Quarter p. 198, a stone lamp-maker's workshop to the south of the palace p. 199, and notes similar provisions at Mallia and Zakro, p. 199. Bore-cores found north of the Royal Road at Knossos indicate a stone-workers' quarter there, p. 199.

discovered Jewellery Workshop at Thebes<sup>10</sup> are two examples. John Chadwick in his discussions on Mycenaean society as revealed in the Linear B tablets has much to say about masons, smiths and textile workers and he believes that "some of these productive services were organised on a scale which fully justifies the title industrial".<sup>11</sup> As far as the design of the Cretan palaces is concerned, Graham has convincingly shown that they are an indigenous creation but he allows some details to be influenced by eastern taste.<sup>12</sup> The transmission of masonry skills may be indicated by the closely similar building techniques observable in the following two pairs of examples.

527. Grave at Ugarit - LBII.

528. Grave P, Circle B, Mycenae - LHIIA.<sup>13</sup>  
Apart from the great similarity in structural detail, both graves lack the stone blocking of the doorway, a regular feature of Mycenaean-built graves.

529. Corbel Vaulted Passage, Hattusas - 15th-13th C.

530. Corbel Vaulted Passage, Tiryns - 14th-13th C.  
The similarity of the two constructions was observed by the photographer's eye before the technical comparison.<sup>14</sup>

- 
10. SYMEONOGLOU (1973) pp. 15-6. Recall the stylistic arguments for a school of Mycenaean Ivory Carvers, above pp. 192-5.
  11. CHADWICK (1976) p. 135. The whole of Chapter 8 is pertinent here. The textual and archaeological evidence for one of the specialized crafts, furniture making, has been outlined by HIGGINS (1956) and HAEVERNICK (1963) writes on the special Mycenaean craft of producing the characteristic blue glass.
  12. GRAHAM (1962), particularly pp. 229-33. He discounts the extreme claims of the excavators of Alalakh and Beycesultan and Mari that Minoan palaces are somehow "imported", but does allow Egyptian-style banquet halls, pp. 125-8. In a later article, GRAHAM (1970), he proposes more Egyptian features at Phaistos. LAWRENCE (1951) also has some pertinent comments on architectural similarities between Crete and the East.
  13. DICKINSON (1977) pp. 64-5 discusses the date of the tomb, comments on its unique form, and points out that the Ugarit tombs are later, as is a similar one at Enkomi.  
MYLONAS (1966) p. 107 also records that Grave Rho "has no parallel in the Mainland of Greece".
  14. SCOUFOPOULOS (1971). Chapter 5 studies the comparisons between Mycenaean fortifications and others, particularly the Hittite fortresses and Troy, and concludes p. 106 that the fortifications of Troy "from a link in the influence spreading westward via the Hittite Kingdom and the coast of Anatolia to Mainland Greece".

With 527 and 528 the discrepancy in the dates does not allow the same craftsman to be involved and this is probably the case also with 529 and 530. The closeness of the comparison however necessitates the mention of these pieces in this enquiry even though each may come to be explained as an independent technological discovery. This point has already been mentioned in connection with the Spiral motif where sporadic examples of simple Spiraliiform design have been attributed to independent discovery.<sup>15</sup> Metal working techniques can dictate certain motif forms like the Spirals created from coiled wire and the torsional effects achieved by twisting the metal forms. At times the metal technology can be traced through pottery shapes which imitate metal vessels. It will probably never be possible to ascertain exactly how much of the advances in technology were due to transference and how much to independent invention. Branigan would allow both for EM III Crete<sup>16</sup> and Davis sees both Minoan and Mycenaean techniques in LHI and II metal work.<sup>17</sup>

Another technology which may transfer the motifs that are associated with its use is that of manufacturing multi-coloured glazed faience. While plain coloured faience objects had been known in Egypt from First Dynasty times, and copied in Syria, the multi-colour technique seems to have been developed in Crete in MMII with the "Town Mosaic" as an example.<sup>18</sup> Stevenson Smith's full treatment of the subject<sup>19</sup> includes the Late Bronze Age developments and descriptions of some of the comparable pieces found in widely separated sites. The three groups of faience vessels from tombs at Ugarit and Enkomi and the House of the Shields at Mycenae<sup>20</sup> should be compared to the rhyton from Abydos, 519, and 326, the Kition Rhyton in the International Style.

---

15. Above pp. 100, 158.

16. BRANIGAN (1970b) pp. 81-3.

17. DAVIS (1977) pp. 328-56.

18. PMI pp. 301-14.

19. SMITH IN Chapter 3 "The Part Played by the Manufacture of Glazed Faïences", pp. 38-50.

20. WACE (1956) pp. 109-12, Pls. 17-21. He suggests a Syrian origin.

## 8 MEANS OF TRANSFERENCE

### Mobility of the Personnel

Mention of the skilled craftsman moving to a new area to work brings up the whole question of mobility of personnel. The craftsman is a special case but there are many others who may find travel to other lands a necessary concomitant of their work. This chapter provides a brief survey of the people themselves, their standing in society, their training in various skills, their freedom of movement, their reactions to disastrous situations either natural or man-made. Any or all of these points may help increase the understanding of how the motifs were transferred. Merchants travelling abroad bring back their traded wares and the officials or soldiers may bring back the occasional souvenir piece thus providing the "direct import" method of transference but they may also bring back ideas from the far countries visited. Having seen a house with fine frescoes or some rich and finely wrought jewellery on his travels, the merchant, official or soldier may be desirous of having similar things round him at home. His commission to a local artist will result in a somewhat imperfect rendition since the working craftsman has not the knowledge of the original, a situation that did not apply with the previously discussed cases. There are also the groups of people who move to settle in a new land. They may do it by choice or, as is more usual, they may be prisoners taken forcibly back to his homeland by the conqueror, or may even be refugees fleeing from the devastation of war or some natural disaster, or they may be the invading peoples themselves who, when they settle in a new land, bring with them much of their old life style which is subsequently adapted to the ways of the new land. In these cases the possibility of accurate motif transmission is much

higher because it is the people themselves who will be working their own familiar motifs in the new area. However while the accuracy may be there because of the understanding of the motif, the modifications demanded by life in the new land may change the externals of the motif.

The evidence available for the mobility of merchants testifies to their resourcefulness from the earliest times. Whether one takes the lists of imported commodities cited in the texts of Old Kingdom Egypt<sup>1</sup> or the raw materials used in the manufacture of the grave goods for the Royal Tombs at Ur,<sup>2</sup> it is quite apparent that merchants already in the third millennium had their regular trade routes established.<sup>3</sup> Even the Akkadian conquerors are said simply to be following in the footsteps of prehistoric traders<sup>4</sup> and the Assyrian Merchant Colony in Anatolia is a late development of earlier trade contacts.<sup>5</sup> Regular trade must have been disrupted in the turmoil at the end of the Early Bronze Age though it is unlikely that contacts were completely severed.

- 
1. Wood, resin, "moringa oil", Syrian pottery, DROWER (1971) p. 350, DE VAUX (1971) p. 229.  
Cicilian pottery, MELLAART (1971) p. 405.
  2. Lapis lazuli, ostrich eggs, mother of pearl, copper, silver, stone and carnelian, MALLOWAN (1971) pp. 285-6.
  3. For comments on the trade routes see DE VAUX (1971) p. 229, DROWER (1971) p. 333. The most important are the Euphrates Route, the Piedmont Route from the Tigris, and the Damascus Route, and the Jordan Valley Route south to Egypt. Khirbet Kerak at the junction of these two last named routes is a trading centre. On the pottery of Khirbet Kerak and its affinities with more northern pottery types, see the article by AMIRAM (1965).  
A brief but useful summary of the pottery correlations for the third millennium is given by DE CONTENSON (1963) pp. 39-40.  
However there will be much to learn from the recent important finds of palace and archives at Tell Mardikh.  
Trade routes within the Aegean are treated by RENFREW (1972), pp. 443, Fig. 20.1.
  4. BOTTERO (1971) p. 322.  
Sargon may not even have been the first conqueror since Lugalzaggisi of Uruk is reputed to have led an army through to Syria. However Sargon's aim to take his conquests "as far as the Forest of Cedars and the Mountains of Silver" reveals the economic demands behind his expansionist policies.
  5. LEWY (1971) p. 714.



Ward has persuasively argued that there was not a complete break between Egypt and northern areas in the First Intermediate Period<sup>6</sup> and that contacts may have been maintained even with the Aegean via the intermediary, Byblos.<sup>7</sup> Syria became increasingly important to trade in the Middle and Late Bronze Age<sup>8</sup> as both an entrepôt<sup>9</sup> and as a trader in many commodities including the famous purple dye.<sup>10</sup> The Syrian trading venture depicted in the Tomb of Kenamon<sup>11</sup> gives an indication of the vitality of Late Bronze Age trading activity. Some Aegean interest in trade with the East is indicated from MMII to LHIIIB by the Minoan and Mycenaean pottery found at eastern sites.<sup>12</sup> However it is difficult to assess how much this was due to Minoans and Mycenaean merchants travelling abroad. The Theran Ship Fresco suggests their vessels were equal to trading ventures but the relatively small amount of Minoan MMII to LMI material in the East, and the fact that the considerable amount of Mycenaean LHIIIA<sub>2</sub> and IIIB pottery is often accompanied by Cypriot wares, suggest that other merchants perhaps Syrians or Cypriots may have been middlemen in the trade. Mycenaean

- 
6. WARD (1971) Chapter 2.
  7. Ibid. pp. 119-25.
  8. Above pp. 179-80.
  9. For other merchants working in the East see HOFFNER (1968-9) pp. 36-8, and GURNEY (1973a) p. 252 who discuss the mention of merchants in Hittite texts and ALBRIGHT (1962) p. 54 who proposes an interpretation of the "Apiru" as "donkey driver", a reference to the men who conducted the great donkey caravan trade in the East.
  10. JENSEN (1963) gives a full discussion of the royal purple.
  11. DAVIES (1947). Both the official buying for Pharaoh and small scale private trading are illustrated and Davies, p. 46, describes the scene as "a vivid glimpse of a side of ancient life which is usually hidden from us".
  12. Map 4 in the Plate Volume gives the sites. HANKEY (1970) pp. 24-5 lists the sites for Minoan pottery. STUBBINGS (1951a) Maps 1, 2, 3 show the distribution of Mycenaean II, IIIA, and IIIB Pottery respectively. HANKEY (1967) adds the later finds. HANKEY (1970) and HANKEY and WARREN (1974) give additional details.

interest in Cyprus in the 14th and 13th centuries is well attested by the number of Mycenaean finds there particularly the Pictorial Style pottery. Sjoqvist's early treatment of the ware under the title Levanto-Helladic lists its characteristic features as being part of the Mycenaean koine, but showing a predilection for certain shapes and special motifs like chariot scenes and Bulls.<sup>13</sup> Furumark's discussion of the Levanto-Mycenaean style under his section on Pictorial Decoration, confirms these main features while giving a fuller discussion of the motifs.<sup>14</sup> The question of the origin of the ware was solved by Catling's researches based on the scientific analysis of the clay, and the Argolid is the source.<sup>15</sup> It would appear that the Mycenaeans were creating a specific product for a specific market, a market they knew well and wished to keep.<sup>16</sup>

Other people who travel because of the professional demands of their career include the Egyptian Nurse Sit-Sneferu who went to Adana,<sup>17</sup> the Egyptian Doctor who was called to Ugarit,<sup>18</sup> the Diviner who was required by Alasiya,<sup>19</sup> and User whose precise reason for visiting Knossos is not known.<sup>20</sup> In addition to these merchants,

---

13. SJOQVIST (1940) pp. 65-73.

14. FURU pp. 430-46.

15. CATLING, RICHARDS and BLINSTOYLE (1963).  
CATLING and MILLET (1965).

16. Cypriot copper would have been in great demand by the Mycenaeans.

17. Illustrated SMITH IN Fig. 23.

18. An inscription of the reign of Ramesses III lists the chief physician Ben-anath. GABALLA (1973) p. 110 notes that the name is West-Semitic and comments on the high repute of Egyptian physicians in western Asia.  
SMITH IN Fig. 41 illustrates the visit of an Egyptian Physician to a Syrian Prince.

19. An "Eagle Conjurer", SMITH IN p. 32.

20. PM I Fig. 220, statue of User found in the Central Court, MMII level. SMITH IN p. 14 believes statues like those of User and Sit-Sneferu were taken by their owners when travelling in case they died abroad.

tradesmen, and professionals there is an elite group of travellers, the couriers and ambassadors, who in the great time of international diplomacy travelled extensively carrying official correspondence between rulers. They would have had ample opportunity to see at the very centre of things in the great royal courts, the very best and the very latest in artistic endeavour. No doubt descriptions of such things were reported back home along with the royal answers and results of treaties. Egypt supplies records of men like Nesumont,<sup>21</sup> Thuthotpe,<sup>22</sup> and Sesostrisankh,<sup>23</sup> Djehuty,<sup>24</sup> and Amenemheb,<sup>25</sup> while the Third Dynasty of Ur leaves notes of its Officials sent to Mari and Byblos.<sup>26</sup> There is an Anatolian at the Byblian court c2000<sup>27</sup> and the Hittites regularly use the policy of stationing kinsmen to the king as administrators in their newly conquered territories.<sup>28</sup> Many of these officials would have resided abroad for varying periods and would have had some of their own countrymen on their staff, thus increasing the possibility of cultural exchange, artistic motifs included.

---

21. POSENER (1971) pp. 537-8.

22. Ibid. p. 546.

23. Ibid. p. 546.

24. DROWER (1973) p. 475.

25. Ibid. p. 456.

26. BOTTERO (1971) p. 560.

27. ALBRIGHT (1959) p. 33, "Kukun, son of the Lycian ...," is mentioned in an Egyptian inscription on an obelisk. "Lycian" translates Lukka but as to the placement of the Lukka lands in Anatolia, uncertainty is our only answer at present. See BRYCE (1974) for a discussion of the Lukka problem.

28. The career of Ini Teshub at Carchemish is a fine example. The power and influence of high-ranking military officers at Ugarit is treated by RAINEY (1965) who also notes, p. 17, the need of "various skilled craftsmen to keep the troops equipped and supplied".

With the movements of large groups of people there are additional aspects to consider. The peaceful settling of people may explain the population movement from north to south Syria in the middle of the third millennium and the infiltration of nomadic peoples into the Egyptian delta area in the 18th century which provided forty-five Asiatics in the service of one household.<sup>29</sup> An exceptional example is the re-settling of the people of Kurushtama in the time of Amenophis II.<sup>30</sup> Natural disasters like drought or earthquake may result in the re-settlement of peoples. In times of war, invasions bring new peoples to the area like those at the end of Early Bronze and the Mitannian incursion which is important to this study since it brings in to the area two new motifs, one of which, the Griffin, was to become most popular in the Late Bronze Age. The taking of prisoners in the expansionist wars of imperialistic kings results in a smaller though not inconsiderable movement of peoples. The exploits of Sargon, Naram-Sin, Shar-kali-sharri and Hammurabi, of Tuthmosis III and Amenophis II and of Murshilish I, Suppiluliumash I and Hattushilish III are well known.<sup>31</sup> It is not with the clash of arms that the artistic transference takes place. The knowledge of battle tactics or of weaponry may be exchanged in times of war but the cultural exchange follows later when the invaders settle down or when the conquerors' administration controls the land and the normal peace time occupations

---

29. HAYES (1973a) p. 49.

30. DROWER (1973) pp. 462-3.

31. Both booty and prisoners are important. Booty provides one of the avenues for the "direct import" means of transference, above p. 222. It would also appear from these accounts that, in the ancient world, men were often taken prisoner along with the women and children, and not simply put to death on defeat.

begin to thrive again. There is a complementary effect on the conqueror's homeland which follows from the resettling of prisoners. Gelb, working on the documents from early Mesopotamia which show the amount of food allotted to these men, women, and children, describes the lot of the prisoners of war at this time and much that he discusses is applicable to the prisoners of war of later times in the ancient world.<sup>32</sup> The Mariyannu were the most prized of Egyptian prisoners, probably for their knowledge of the martial arts and not for any special skill in painting or sculpture. Egyptian music was doubtless improved by the orchestra of maidens with their beautiful instruments from Syria<sup>33</sup> and certainly the number of Egyptian craftsmen in the New Kingdom was swelled by the prisoners of war who were set to work by their new masters. The prisoners of the Hittites form the NAM.RA class whose movements are restricted by the King.<sup>34</sup> It would be most likely that the Mycenaeans too acquired captives and slaves in their various activities about the Aegean. This would explain the presence of some five hundred women employed in the textile trade in the Kingdom of Pylos. Five of the groups of women, who are always designated by

---

32. GELB (1973), particularly the Conclusions pp. 95-6. In his Introduction, p. 70, he listed five possible groups of dependent labour, "(1) subject ethnos, derived from the native population of a country conquered by an alien people coming from outside; (2) foreign-born piracy slavery, which includes individuals ... who were utilized abroad; (3) house-born slavery, which includes individuals born of one or both slave parents and remaining in a slave status; (4) native impoverished classes, represented by native-born poor or impoverished people or their descendants who have lost, for one reason or another, their own means of livelihood and have been forced directly to labour for another household; and (5) foreign prisoners of war.

33. DROWER (1973) p. 461.

34. HOFFNER (1968-9) p. 39 and GELB (1973) pp. 79, 93. Also CROSSLAND (1967) p. 107 in comparing Hittite and Mycenaean economies.

occupation and by geographical origin, are listed as coming from Miletos, Knidos, Lemnos, and probably Asia and Halicarnassos.<sup>35</sup>

Of Aegean involvement in mobility of personnel the pictorial record gives some examples of foreign peoples in the Aegean and of Aegeans<sup>36</sup> in the East. Plates 531 to 536 are depictions of non-Aegean types in Minoan and Mycenaean art.

- 531. Amygdaloid Seal from Knossos - Late Palace Period.  
Man holding a Dove.  
The clothing is the long straight robe with diagonal banding which probably indicates overlapping of the cloth. There appears to be a fringed shawl also. He does not have the Minoan hairstyle.
- 532. Amygdaloid Seal from Knossos - Late Palace Period.  
Man with an Axe over his shoulder.  
This shows the same type of gown and the same absence of Minoan hairstyle. The shape of the axe matches the one in 535.
- 533. Wall Painting from Knossos - Late Palace Period.  
Man with Black Skin.  
Unfortunately this fragment does not give the whole face so the features cannot be observed.
- 534. Wall Painting from Thera - LMIA.  
Heads from the Theran Ship Fresco.  
The hair is worn short though some have a "Minoan curl" at forehead. Not all the hair is black; much is brown, some quite fair. The nose is generally tip-tilted or snub.<sup>37</sup>  
If these figures do represent the Therans themselves, as seems highly likely, then they do not all follow the classic Minoan dress of codpiece and long curled locks. The magnificent ships would suggest the owners of these visages travelled widely.

---

35. CHADWICK (1976) pp. 80-1, 152.

36. There are two Aegean types, the Minoan and the Mycenaean. First is the distinctive Minoan type with curled hair styles and appropriate dress of codpiece or kilt for male and elaborate flounced dress and embroidered bodice with bare breast for women. The second is the Mycenaean type with short straight hair and beard for men, longer curled hair for women and a tunic of varying length for both. In early Mycenaean art, many female figures wear the Cretan dress, though a blouse is often added. DEMARGNE (1946) discusses a seal from Mallia with a similar figure. He accepts pp. 151, 153 a Syrian connection. SEYRIG (1955) p. 30 notes the same connection. Note how closely the robe matches the depictions of Syrians in 18th Dynasty tomb paintings, and the robes of the figures on Hyksos scarabs from Canaan, TUFNELL (1956).

37. Found also in Minoan frescoes. However note the "long-nosed" Cretans, discussed by DESSENNE (1949), and LEVI (1956) p. 199.

535. Amygdaloid Seal from Vaphio - LHII.  
 Man with an Axe over his shoulder.  
 This shows the same long straight robe with diagonal marking as seen in 531, 532 and worn by the man leading the Griffin 22.  
 The axe is of the same type as in 532 and like the bronze axe found at Vaphio. All are of the Syrian fenestrated axe type giving the figures, robes included, a distinct Asiatic cast.<sup>38</sup>
536. Cylinder Seal from Thebes - LHIIIB context.<sup>39</sup>  
 This has been compared with Cypriot seals. It does have as its main themes the favourite Mycenaean motifs of the Duel and Animal Attack. The dress of the man is of the eastern type like the ones worn by the Reshep figurine 521.

Plates 537 to 540 show some of the depictions of Aegean types in Egyptian tomb paintings.

537. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
 Figure of a Minoan from Senmut's Tomb.<sup>40</sup>  
 These are the earliest of the Aegean portrayals and they show the Aegean gifts correctly and the Minoan codpiece and originally the Minoan hair style as well.<sup>41</sup> The figures next in date<sup>42</sup> come from the tomb of Rekhmire and there the artist had begun to draw a codpiece but changed it to a kilt.<sup>43</sup>
538. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
 Figure of a Minoan from the Tomb of Menkheperasonb.  
 The gifts are appropriate and the hair is in the Minoan style. A kilt is now worn.<sup>44</sup>

- 
38. Compare the illustrations in PRITCHARD (1951) who treats the dress of Asiatics in Egyptian tombs.  
 Note also the fenestrated bronze axe of Syrian type found at Vaphio, WACE (1949) Pl. 110. Compare the fine gold example from Byblos, CULICAN (1966) 18.
39. SYMEONOGLOU (1973) p. 48 considers this seal probably of Cypriot manufacture, and gives comparisons.
40. The full treatment of the subject, both textual and pictorial, is of course VERCOUTTER (1956). See also MERRILLEES (1972) who takes the pottery into account and considers that the Mycenaeans superseded the Minoans in the reign of Hatshepsut, p. 293.  
 See also FURUMARK (1950) pp. 224-39.
41. The long ringlets indicated by dotted lines were seen by the early copyists but had disappeared by the time of the Davies copy, DAVIES, Nina M. (1936) *Ancient Egyptian Paintings* Vols. I, XIV. Mrs. Davies discusses the point, Vol. III, p. 32.
42. SMITH AA p. 141-3. The tombs of Senmut, Rekhmire, and Menkheperasonb and their depictions of different racial types are discussed.
43. SMITH IN Fig. 91.  
 CADOGAN (1969) p. 152 suggests this may reflect the Mycenaean control of Knossos from LMII.
44. See the illustration in colour DAVIES (1936) XXI and compare the other Minoans who are similarly treated in XXII and XXIII.

539. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Figure of a Syrian from the Tomb of Menkheperasonb.  
This figure may represent a Syrian.  
He wears a kilt and there is some attempt at a Minoan hair style. Yet he has blue eyes and a fair beard as does the man next but one behind him.<sup>45</sup>
540. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
Figure of Syrian and his Wife from the Tomb of Nebamun.  
The elaborate costume of the woman is worthy of comment.  
Soderbergh believes it does not indicate any particular period or nationality but merely the flounced dress of wealthy Syrian woman as compared to a servant or slave.<sup>46</sup>  
However it is possible that the Wife is Cretan.  
The hair-style and the dotted edging and well-marked flounces of the dress could be an Egyptian artist's attempt to render Minoan ringlets and the elaborate fitted Minoan bodice and the complicated layered Minoan skirt.

In all these only the first portrayal in Senmut's tomb gives the classic Minoan in all features. The later ones from the tomb of Menkheperasonb may still represent true Cretans, simply marking the variation in fashion from codpiece to kilt which is known from the Knossos frescoes. Other figures show such mixtures of features that one cannot be sure that distinctive racial types are meant. However bearded Mycenaeans may be among those with mixtures of Minoan and Syrian characteristics.<sup>47</sup>

In Egypt and Asia there is evidence, much of it textual, to suggest that the mobility of personnel in the Bronze Age is one of the main means of motif transference. The evidence from the Aegean is slighter since there is little in the Linear B texts to extend the elusive pictorial record. However there are at least five Semitic loan words in Linear B<sup>48</sup> suggesting some intercommunication between Mycenaeans and Easterners of the Levantine coast.<sup>49</sup>

- 
45. DAVIES (1936) XXIV. It is exceptional to find blue eyes in Egyptian tomb paintings.
46. SAVE-SODERBERGH (1957) p. 26.
47. FURUMARK (1950) pp. 238-9.
48. HOOKER (1976) p. 117, ki-to, ku-mi-no, ku-pa-ro, ku-ru-so, sa-sa-me like the Ugaritic words ktn, kmn, kpr, hrs, ssmn, for tunic, cummin, galingale, gold, and sesame.  
VENTRIS and CHADWICK (1973) discuss the borrowings more fully, pp. 91, 131, 135-6, 319-20, 343. It is also likely that po-ni-ke for griffin(?), po-ni-ki-ja for red, e-re-pa-te-jo for ivory, and re-wo-te-jo for lion come from the East, Ibid. pp. 91, 345-6.
49. CHADWICK (1976) p. 144.



## 8 MEANS OF TRANSFERENCE

### Royal Prerogative

The role of kings and princes in facilitating inter-communication in the ancient world is not confined to waging war and carrying off booty and prisoners. The princely letters of the Late Bronze Age<sup>1</sup> issue congratulations, like those of the Kings of Babylonia and Assyria and the Hittites to Tuthmosis III after his victorious campaigns in Syria.<sup>2</sup> They make requests and accede to them. Niqmadu of Ugarit would like the services of an Egyptian doctor, the King of Alasiya the services of an Eagle Diviner.<sup>3</sup> Pharaoh will send grain to the Hittite lands stricken with famine?<sup>4</sup> The Hittite Great King welcomes a member of the Ahhiyawan royal house to learn chariot driving.<sup>5</sup> The Mitannian King will loan the statue of Ishtar of Nineveh a second time because there is illness again in the house of Pharaoh.<sup>6</sup> Treaties of peace and friendship are arranged between Kizzuwadna and the Hittites, between Egypt and Mitanni, Egypt and the Hittites, while various arrangements are made for Egypt's vassal states in Syria. This friendly correspondence is paralleled by the munificent gifts sent from one king to another. Stevenson Smith regards this royal gift-giving as the single most important factor in developing the International Style.<sup>7</sup>

- 
1. For the Amarna Letters, ALBRIGHT (1975). Earlier in the 18th century, the Mari Letters give evidence of considerable intercommunications. BIROT (1973) discusses some newly-found texts and, in commenting on the rich goods passing between Mari, Hazor and Aleppo concludes, p. 10, that "l'or, l'argent et les pierres précieuses étaient un des éléments des échanges commerciaux entre l'Ouest et l'Est." ALBRIGHT (1945) p. 9 notes that the King of Byblos sent Zimrilim a gold vase.
  2. DROWER (1973) p. 457.
  3. Above p. 233.
  4. FAULKNER (1975) p. 274.
  5. STUBBINGS (1975) pp. 186-7.
  6. DROWER (1973) p. 489.
  7. SMITH IN p. 32.

541. Obsidian Casket from Byblos - 18th C.  
 Gift of Pharaoh to Ypschemu-abī the Prince of Byblos.  
 Found in the Royal Tombs this piece represents the  
 finest Egyptian work and carries the titles of  
 Ammenemes IV.<sup>8</sup>
542. Wall Painting, Thebes - Dyn. XVIII.  
 Gold set piece among New Year's gifts to Amenophis II.  
 An extravaganza of foliate designs and scampering  
 monkeys from the Tomb of Kenamon.

Other fine pieces which may represent royal gifts are the sphinxes from Byblos, Qatna and Ugarit and the alabastron of Khyan.<sup>9</sup> The rich material and exquisite workmanship of gaming boards<sup>10</sup> and the twelve gold plates with all over spiraliform designs<sup>11</sup> suggest they may have been commissioned as royal gifts. However there is much that is called "gift" or "tribute" at this time which may simply represent traded items, the King being the trader in chief. This explanation of "disguised state trading" is very strongly argued by Cyril Aldred who nevertheless allows that for grand occasions like accessions or jubilees embassies with gifts would have been sent to Pharaoh.<sup>12</sup> Still, when considering motif transference the exact category is not a concern. Whichever reason prompted the princes, the resulting transfer of rich and costly items, many of them intricately wrought, is helpful to motif transference. In the Aegean, the cache of fine seals found at Thebes has been explained as a princely present, and

- 
8. As did the gifts in his father's tomb.  
 Illustrated in colour CULICAN (1966) 8, 9.
9. PMI p. 419, Fig. 304b.  
 For other pieces at Baghdad and Bogazkoy, SMITH IN p. 23.
10. ELLIS (1966) has distinguished four groups of gaming boards in use from Ur to Egypt. The Enkomi Box, 367, and the Knossos board, PM I Pl. V, should also be considered.
11. Now in various museums and private collections on three continents. PARROT (1964) discusses the workmanship and allows also, p. 249, the possibility of their being Syrian work under Mycenaean influence. However the rapport designs are so cleverly executed that they argue Aegean work.
12. ALDRED (1970) pp. 111, 115. See also GADD (1975) pp. 23-4 for Assyrian demands.

possibly the lapis lazuli found there is also a gift.<sup>13</sup> It may be that the prince becomes a collector and gathers together prize pieces which delight him. Such has been given as an explanation for the collection of Megiddo Ivories.<sup>14</sup>

543. Ivory Comb from Megiddo - 13th C.

This has been interpreted as a Mycenaean import as has another from the same collection 132. Other pieces include the Hittite piece 219 and the Syrian plaque 402.

The collections and gifts need not of course be in manufactured articles or in raw materials like gold and lapis lazuli but may come from the world of nature. The earliest record of animals sent to a foreign court are the Syrian bears for Sahure.<sup>15</sup> In the New Kingdom there is Hatshepsut's famous expedition to Punt and Tuthmosis III brought back plants from his Syrian Campaign.<sup>16</sup> Tribute from Nubia always included animals of the wild and Tuthmosis III was given the novel present of four domestic fowls.<sup>17</sup> All these activities do not of course directly help motifs transfer but they are yet another example of international relations and the interest that at least Egyptian Pharaohs had in foreign flora and fauna. It is not perhaps too great a step to look at the Knossos and Theran frescoes and find in the paintings of monkeys and antelopes a record not of animals far away but of ones living in some royal garden, the gift of a royal friend overseas.

---

13. The King of Assyria sent Tuthmosis III a gift of lapis lazuli, DROWER (1973) p. 452.

14. LOUD (1939) and also FRANK AA pp. 157-9 who discusses the Aegean, Hittite, and Syrian traits of the pieces in the collection.

15. SMITH IN Fig. 8.

16. The specimens are recorded in reliefs at Karnak. SMITH IN Fig. 199 and p. 161.

17. DROWER (1973) p. 452.

Few peaceful visits of royalty abroad are recorded. The King of Ugarit had expressed a desire to see the splendid palace of Zimrilim at Mari so the King of Aleppo arranged for a representative to go in his stead.<sup>18</sup> A Semite prince visited Middle Kingdom Egypt and Tuthmosis III went elephant hunting at Niy on his way home from campaigning.<sup>19</sup> It is possible that Khattushilish III came to Egypt for the marriage of his daughter to Ramesses II and this may be the significance of the relief at Abu Simbel 544.

544. Relief, Abu Simbel - 13th C.  
Khattushilish III and his Daughter.

Dynastic marriages may be one of the most important ways in which the royal prerogative may shape affairs. One of the early marriages recorded was that linking the royal houses of Mari and Aleppo in the brilliant years of the early 18th century.<sup>20</sup> In the Late Bronze Age many dynastic marriages were arranged,<sup>21</sup> some where the request was not fulfilled, and one where the breaking of the marriage resulted in an international scandal.<sup>22</sup> The most notable dynastic marriages of the 14th and 13th centuries were those arranged between the great powers of the time; the marriages between the Egyptian and Mitannian royal houses for three generations, the marriages of Tuthmosis IV and Amenophis III to Babylonian princesses, and the marriage between

---

18. SMITH IN p. 17.

19. FAULKNER (1946) discusses the Euphrates campaign.

20. KUPPER (1973) p. 32.

21. For the Babylonian marriages see BRINKMAN (1972) p. 275. Indeed the whole article is most pertinent since it summarizes Babylonian foreign relations from 1600 to 625.

22. Requests were sent to Egyptian Pharaohs for marriage alliances by the Kings of Arzawa and Alasiya and then there is the extraordinary entreaty by the widow of Tutankhamun to the Hittite King Shuppiluliumash I for one of his sons to be her husband, a desperate but unsuccessful plea. The scandal concerned the city of Ugarit, see MORAN (1959). The wife of Ammistamru, King of Ugarit, after committing her "great sin", (adultery?), fled to Sausgamuwa, King of Amurru. The Hittite King, Tudkhaliash IV intervened and insisted on her return.

Ramesses II and the Hittite princess. The kings of the great powers also contracted marriages with the royal houses of the smaller states in alliance with them; Syrian princesses were married into the Egyptian royal household, Niqmadu of Ugarit may have married an Egyptian princess,<sup>23</sup> and the Hittite kings arranged dynastic marriages with the Kings of Kizzuwadna in the time of Shuppiluliumash I and again when Khattushilish III married Pudu-Kheba.<sup>24</sup> In the Aegean the lack of written records allows only conjecture that dynastic marriages were arranged between royal families of Crete and the Mainland in the 16th and the 15th centuries,<sup>25</sup> and between the princely houses of the Mainland kingdoms. When dynastic marriages are arranged they provide another avenue for cultural transference and within that, the motif migration in art. Whether one considers simply the tightening of the links which bind the two royal houses, or the number of servants in the retinue of the bride coming to live in the new land,<sup>26</sup> or the desire of the young woman herself to be surrounded with things familiar, the opportunities for cultural exchange are extensive.

The desires of a Monarch are a most important means of establishing international connections whether they be by waging war, sponsoring trade, exchanging letters and gifts, or in dynastic marriages.

---

23. See the vase 401.

24. GOETZE (1975a) pp. 6-8, (1975b) p. 127.

25. POPHAM (1974) pp. 255-6, discussing the relations between Crete and the Mainland allows this as one of the possible ways a Mycenaean control of Knossos was effected from 1450 to 1400.

26. Gilu-hepa brought 317 Mitannian girls to the Egyptian court.

## 9 THE ACCEPTANCE AND REJECTION OF MOTIFS

### Aegean Attitudes

The motif investigation of *Part I* has revealed that Aegean art accepts only some of the eastern motifs into its art and that these may not even be the great and pervasive motifs of the East like the Smiting Figure or the Winged Sun Disk. Again the most beloved of Minoan and Mycenaean motifs may not be the ones to be taken over into the arts of the East. The Bull Sports remain Minoan and the Duel is always Mycenaean though one may consider both motifs just as impressive as the Flying Gallop which did migrate east. It is clear that neither the striking nature of the design nor its popularity in its own tradition constitute the necessary criteria for the migration of motifs. In this chapter an attempt is made to find the criteria, to probe the reasons for Aegean acceptance of some motifs, rejection of others. It is realized that to initiate this type of enquiry is to step outside those narrow limits imposed in the *Introduction*<sup>1</sup> and strictly adhered to in the rest of the thesis, the limits of close observation of iconographical detail. This chapter moves into areas of content and meaning and is therefore more speculative than earlier sections but it is undertaken with a view to better understanding the nature of Minoan and Mycenaean art.

In the East, the strong artistic traditions of Mesopotamia and Egypt which are created out of and yet serve, their own cultures find few motifs from the other culture useful or intelligible. It is much more in the peripheral areas of Syria and Anatolia that the transference of motifs is observable, and this is true of the Aegean also.

---

1. Above pp. 8-10.

Of the motifs which migrate to the Aegean, the Heraldic Poses and Antithetical Group are motifs of method, but related to content. Each provides a different means of organizing artistic elements into a distinctive design and as such each is a most useful convention for the artist to have at his disposal. The Heraldic Poses are raised to a new level of importance by the Mycenaean artists. While they use them in the old eastern ways for the portrayal of animals in conjunction with other figures and as subsidiary motifs, they also make the animal heraldically posed the sole subject of a design. This is indeed one of their favourite devices for seal designs and results in some magnificent gems like the Pylos seal 123.

The Antithetical Group is a motif which produces an integrated design unit. Worked on the principle of balance about a central focus it relates the two flanking figures to the centre piece in such a way that a unitary effect is created. This motif is most useful for portraying the two great themes of Mesopotamian art, the Contest Scenes and the Animals at the Tree of Life, and Aegean art continues to use it for its own versions of these themes, but also extends its use to organize more specifically Aegean material, namely Animals attendant at the Sacred Pillar, as on the Lion Gate at Mycenae, 46.

For these two motifs the reason for acceptance must be combination of artistic usefulness and association with certain specific subject matter which also migrates to the Aegean. The predilection of Mycenaean artists for the full range of variants of these two motifs provides one of the points of contrast between Minoan and Mycenaean art. The interest of the Mycenaeans in tightly controlled artistic designs ultimately produces compositions like that most economically organized of all Antithetical Groups, the paired animals sharing one head, 60 and 28.

The next six motifs which migrate west, the Master of Animals, Mistress of Animals, Sphinx, Griffin, Thoueris, and the Animals at the Tree of Life form what might be called a religious group. They represent gods or divine powers, or the god-king Pharaoh, or have some ritual symbolism - in short they have some religious connotation in their homeland. Again the same general pattern of acceptance is observable. Neither old tradition accepts the other's motifs. The Master and Mistress of Animals do not go to Egypt; the Egyptian Sphinx and Thoueris do not go to Mesopotamia. However, Syria and Anatolia accept a mixture of these motifs along with the Mitannian Griffin and Aegean art accepts them all.

The Master of Animals may come to Crete and the Mainland simultaneously but the Mistress of Animals certainly comes into Mycenaean art by way of Crete. The Mistress figure assumes there the Minoan dress and acquires Minoan attendants, indications that the motif has been carefully assimilated. This is not to say that the motif has the same meaning as it had in the Near Eastern traditions. That may or may not be so. In the absence of any Minoan texts that can be translated to explain the meaning one can go no further than say the Minoans had need of an artistic motif expressing divine or human power over animals and the ready-made motif from the eastern artistic traditions fitted the requirements. The Mycenaeans take over the Mistress and add new attendants. Their acceptance is explained by the overwhelming influence of Minoan art upon the development of Mycenaean art particularly in the sphere of religious iconography. The acceptance of other religious symbols from Crete like the Sacred Pillar and Sacred Horns are parallel examples.

The acceptance of the Sphinx and Griffin into Aegean art follows somewhat different lines. The strict iconography associated with the Egyptian Sphinx and Griffin did not find any real acceptance in the peripheral cultures. This is not surprising as no other country



had a Pharaoh. Instead the people to Egypt's north took the Sphinx and moulded it to their own ways and accepted instead of the Egyptian Griffin the Mitannian Griffin. The extreme popularity in the East of the Sphinx and Griffin could be one of the factors that recommended them to the Aegean. That Mycenaean art accepted the new changed Sphinx through the channel of Minoan art seems clear because of its acceptance of the Priest King Hat, the Minoan equivalent of the Syrian modifications of Pharaoh's crowns. This also indicates some of the original symbolism is accepted. The Griffin however is different and may not have come to the Aegean via Crete. In view of its early well-developed iconography on the Mainland, and in view of its great popularity in later Mycenaean art in contrast to the relatively few Minoan examples, there would seem to be more to the Mycenaean acceptance of the Mitannian Griffin than can be explained by the popularity of the motif further east. It may be that the Griffin has ever been a creature in the folk-lore of northern peoples from Europe and the Caucasian Steppes and that it only becomes historically traceable when their irruption into the southern civilized areas provides an opportunity for the Griffin to be recorded in durable art forms. The first Griffin types are from Susa with bird talons as well as lion limbs. Their predatory nature is better seen in Amiet's hunter Griffin<sup>2</sup> than in the illustration under the Griffin discussion, 109. The next time they appear is in Syrian art after the Hurrian and Mitannian incursions and then strongly in Mitannian glyptic also. Again they are shown as predators as well as in the usual heraldic roles. The Griffin is after all a minor Near Eastern motif and the Mycenaeans make it one of their major motifs. The Minoans only sparingly use the Griffin motif compared to the Mycenaeans who work it on small

---

2. AMIET 417 where the Griffin carries home a dead stag in its beak.  
See also above 109.

scale seals, fine ivory, and grand frescoes, both in heraldic pose and as the violent predator. One can even suppose the wingless Griffins to be a symbol of the power of the Griffin residing with the royal house of Pylos, never more to fly away out of man's grasp, a 13th century precursor to the Nike Apteros of the Classical period. The earlier wingless Griffins from the Throne Room at Knossos may indeed be another indication of Mycenaean influence in the palace in the final period and an indication of close links with Pylos for nowhere else in the Aegean world are there wingless Griffins. Perhaps the Mycenaeans simply found in the Griffin a suitable symbol for their own fearsome aggression.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps there is some link between the Mycenaeans, the Mitannians, and northern peoples, a link which cannot as yet be clearly discerned, but which could account for the Mycenaeans' ardent adoption of the Griffin motif. Perhaps it is the Mycenaeans' own origin that holds the answer to their attachment to the Griffin.

The Minoan Genius is accepted into Mycenaean art following its shaping in Minoan art, and, as if to prove its complete Aegeanization, there is no reversal to a more convincing hippopotamus shape for all the Mycenaean contacts with the East in the 14th and 13th centuries. But why did the Minoans accept and transform Thoueris? She is after all not one of the great Egyptian goddesses though her role as protectress in childbirth makes her a most useful deity. She must seem one of the strangest to foreigners who, not being intimate with Nile aquatic life, cannot conceive of a hippopotamus. Nor was she ever taken up in Palestine and Syria as one of their major deities. Evans' complex astronomical argument does not really help explain the transference at all, but it is possible to accept his point of the protective role of

---

3. On aggression and attack themes in Mycenaean art, above pp. 121-3, 143, 152.

Thoueris, a point accepted also by Gill who would also suggest some special need which prompted the migration of the motif. Gill proposes that the special need is the new situation created by the change-over to a palace-centred bureaucracy.<sup>4</sup> However another need can be suggested, one that would explain the resulting development of the Minoan Genius' iconography more explicitly. If Crete were suffering a prolonged drought and the need was a need for rain, then the Minoans might well send to the older civilizations of the East for the help of some beneficent deity.<sup>5</sup> Even if they did not journey to Egypt itself they would meet Thoueris in Syria and be aware of her protective and beneficent role from the amulets. Some knowledge of her original form as a creature of the Nile River habitat may also have come through to Syria along with her apotropaic role. In Syria also they would meet all the iconography from the Mesopotamian tradition associated with procuring fresh water and fertilizing rain, the Flowing Vase and the God with Streams. The Mesopotamians are, after all, more familiar with the problems of drought than the dwellers of the Nile valley and their symbols might be thought particularly potent. A return to Crete with a beneficent demon compounded of the strengths of both old civilizations and a subsequent breaking of the drought would ensure the retention of the deity in the Minoan Pantheon and its happy adoption of Minoan iconography in artistic portrayals. If this seems an unlikely scenario it is no more unlikely than the actual transference of this unusual motif, and as Gill has pointed out, some exceptional reason is needed to explain the unlikely migration.

---

4. GILL (1964) p. 5. "In so conservative a thing as religion, introduction of foreign elements is never just the automatic result of contact between cultures. For people to turn to untried powers, knowledge of these must coincide with the recognition of some inadequacy, some need that the native gods are unable to fulfill."

5. Such quests are not unknown in the ancient world, above pp. 233, 240.

It is not surprising that one of the eastern Sacred Tree variants finds its way into Aegean art. The Animals at the Tree of Life is one of the most widely used motifs of the Mesopotamian tradition and, because it signifies the close relationship between plant and animal life, it would recommend itself to Aegean Bronze Age peoples since they, like all early communities, are dependent on the fecundity of the earth and the vitality of the flocks and herds. Along with their own Sacred Tree symbols of trees and boughs on Altars and Sacred Horns the Minoans and Mycenaeans began to use the Animals at the Tree of Life motif, not usually placing the Tree on a Scale Mountain but possibly on an Altar or Sacred Horns and using their own animals. These Aegean adaptations reveal a significant level of understanding of the Mesopotamian symbol, but they are only adaptations for the motif appears to be too expressive an artistic symbol for them to want to change it radically. In the Aegean the Sacred Pillar is iconographically interchangeable with the Sacred Tree. This is not to say they mean the same but simply to point out that one vertical symbol of supreme importance in the Aegean is a suitable substitute iconographically for another vertical symbol of extreme importance.<sup>6</sup> On the significance of the strength of the supporting pillar in Aegean lands which are so subject to seismic activity, much has already been said.

The third motif of method, the Mirror Reverse, is less frequently used in Mycenaean art than the other two. It is not so closely linked to eastern subject matter as the Heraldic Poses and Antithetical Group except perhaps for its use in Syria for pairing Lions, Sphinxes and Griffins. In its original home, Egypt, it provided the perfect visual expression of that all-

---

6. YAKAR (1974) pp. 157-9 discusses the pillar-tree link in investigating the furnishing of the Shrine at Beycesultan.

pervasive theme in Egyptian life, the duality of the Two Lands. The Mirror Reverse gives full scope to the balance and antithesis so loved by the Egyptian and, in the careful placement of symbols each side of the median line, it indicates the duality in their social, political, ecological, and artistic life - Upper and Lower; white crown, red crown; vulture and cobra; sedge and papyrus... This duality can have no meaning in the Syrian or Aegean sphere so if the motif did transfer it is likely to be the usefulness of the motif as a means of organizing artistic material that recommends it to the Syrian and to the Mycenaean artist.

If it is the Egyptian crocodile which transfers to produce the Minoan crocodile, then it may simply be the strangeness of the form which appeals. In Aegean art there appears to be no religious connotation for the Minoan crocodile nor any close relationship with Thoueris, whereas both of these features are found with crocodiles in Egyptian art.

The Babylonian Dragon may have transferred with details mistaken because its iconography is too intimately bound up with specific deities of the Mesopotamian pantheon.

The Tree-watering Ritual variant of the Sacred Tree motif may also be too intimately bound up with the Mesopotamian situation to gain wide acceptance in the Aegean. The Tree-watering Ritual, together with the other motifs of water symbolism, the Flowing Vase and the God with Streams, belong to the land of broad rivers where man's organization can channel the flow into canals and thus bring fertility to the earth. In the Aegean where rivers are often spring torrents drying up in the summer the supply of water must more be linked to the thunderstorm and the welling spring. It is significant that the few examples where a

foliate symbol is about to be watered, the dutiful attendant is usually also from the East but adapted to local requirements, the Minoan Genius.

For the common floral motifs and the decorative patterns indigenous creation in each separate tradition has been suggested but, if there is transference of a few special iconographical details, then the reason is likely to be artistic usefulness. The specific details of the Palm, Palmette, Papyrus and Rosette forms provide decorative fan-shaped and circular floral forms and the Quatrefoil has the added appeal of providing a lacy all-over pattern. Such useful forms would readily recommend themselves to the acquisitive Aegean artists who then extended their usage to complement their own Spiral designs or create new motifs like the Triglyph and Half Rosette. The generally accepted view that this motif is a Minoan creation taken over into Mycenaean art poses some artistic problems. The whole spirit of the design is Mainland Mycenaean. The precision with which it is wrought, the static effect of the vertical tang severing whatever circular spirit is in the Rosette design, are not in accord with the movement and torsional effects usually observable in Minoan art. Wace is quite prepared to see this as a Mycenaean design and the Minoan examples as indications of Mainland influence on the art of the late period of the Knossos palace and he may well be right.<sup>7</sup>

The sporadic use of some eastern motifs in Aegean art, or their complete rejection, is a most interesting problem. The Smiting Figure is a bold striking motif, extremely popular in both the Egyptian

---

7. VENTRIS (1956). Foreword by A.J.B. Wace, pp. xxiii, xxiv.  
 "The stratification of the fragments from Knossos is by no means secure; they belong to the upper strata of the palace, and are probably due to Mainland influence".

and the Syrian-Anatolian traditions, powerful in meaning since for each tradition it represents the most important personage. The visual impact and the popularity, however, are as nothing to the Aegeans who never take up the motif. The rejection cannot be because they already have satisfactory symbolic representations of the overpowering might of a God-King or of the Weather God wielding thunder-bolt or lightning flash. There are none. It must simply be that neither symbolism of the Smiting Figure has any meaning in the Aegean sphere. Zeus may already be in the Linear B tablets but he has not yet received his characteristic iconography in art.

Again the Star Disk in Crescent and all the associated celestial symbols, so popular in the Mesopotamian tradition find no real acceptance in Aegean art, only the occasional rendition as in the signets, 143 and 339. This, in spite of their ubiquitous presence in cylinder seal designs, can only indicate that their symbolism is of little use to the Minoans and Mycenaeans.

The Winged Sun Disk is another widely used distinctive eastern motif. By the 14th and 13th centuries it was recognized not only as the ancient symbol of Pharaoh but also as the sign of the Great King of the Hittites.<sup>8</sup> Again, one concludes from the total Aegean embargo on the motif that such a symbol of god protected monolithic royal power is not required in Minoan Crete or Mycenaean Greece.

The Mesopotamian Scale Mountain is another strong eastern motif, widely used in the early periods and taken into Hittite art of the Empire, but it too is virtually ignored by Aegean art in spite of the mountainous nature of Crete and the Mycenaean lands. Again it must

---

8. With accretions from the repertoire of Mesopotamian celestial symbols. See above p. 119.

be that this symbol of the abode of the gods was not sufficiently apposite to Minoan and Mycenaean religious thought for a full and lasting transference.

In the case of the favourite Aegean motifs which made so little impact on the older established eastern traditions, it can hardly be expected that comparatively new and peripheral cultures would be able to influence greatly the ancient and still strong central traditions. Further the motif may be so closely identified with the culture or the local environment that it will not be accepted by another area since there it has no meaning. This was the basic reason for the rejection by the Aegeans of all the great eastern motifs listed in Chapter 3 and it would seem that the same reason explains the fact that the favourite Aegean motifs of Chapter 3 are never really accepted into the eastern arts.

The Duel concept in Mycenaean art is one of their most widely used motifs, organizing as it does their battle scenes, man versus man and man versus animal, and their Animal Attack scenes where animal strikes down animal.<sup>9</sup> It is a true Mycenaean creation and very revealing of their *Weltanschauung*. In this it is to be set beside the other well-loved motif and grand symbol of supreme aggressiveness, the Mycenaean Griffin. However the Duel is not the battle concept of the eastern traditions where the role of the conquering King is the most important message to communicate. Whatever faint reflections of the Mycenaean Duel motif there are in Syrian art they do not, in their static rendering,

---

9. The motif of the lion-bull combat is an ancient one in the East. Its reflection of the natural world is reinforced by astronomical symbolism if HARTNER (1965) is correct. However my stress on the distinctive Mycenaean Animal Attack motif has been based on the artistic rendering. The violence and aggression of the Mycenaean creations are entirely different to the static codified forms of eastern art.



give any real insight into the Mycenaean value placed on the valiant heroism of the individual warrior.

The Bull Sports are Minoan and any eastern imitation of them cannot match the verve and spirit of the original Minoan compositions. Again it is too local in content ever to escape its Aegean confines.

The Marine motifs and the conventions for rocky landscapes are too closely linked to the sea shores and rocky hillsides of Aegean lands to recommend themselves to eastern traditions unfamiliar with that environment.<sup>10</sup> This could also be the reason for the Tricurved Arch motif generally remaining in the Aegean. One could perhaps have expected it to travel to the East since it is a delightful decorative pattern and can very easily be detached from its original Aegean use of seascape for even the Aegeans themselves used it in a purely decorative way. If however, the Tricurved Arch were originally inspired by the looped patterns of ripple marks in the sand made by a retreating tide, and thus thought by the observant Aegean to be a truer representation of sea scape than the plain Scale Pattern, then it would be this original association with local environment which precluded the migration of the motif eastwards.

The two motifs which do manage to penetrate the eastern traditions are two with no inner meaning or symbolism and no close links with the Aegean environment, the elaborate Spiral patterns and the convention for rendering animal poses, the Flying Gallop. Both can thus easily be divorced from any Aegean heritage and taken up by any art desiring such useful motifs.

---

10. Coastal Syria could share some of these features of the Aegean but Syrian art, to date, gives little evidence of interest in depicting landscapes.

The family of Spiral designs was taken up by Egypt who had no rapport patterns of its own. Egyptian border patterns in particular are quite static, like the rows of Djed pillars, Ankhs, or Knots, and no doubt Egyptian artists could see the usefulness of such interlocking designs as the spiraliform patterns. Syria already had its interlocking border pattern in the Guilloche and so only gave limited acceptance to the running Spiral. The much more intricate all-over Spiral designs like the quadrilateral and interlocked C spiral patterns found less acceptance in the East except perhaps for the ceiling designs of Egypt. The reason for their comparative rejection could simply be the degree of difficulty their intricacies presented to artisans unfamiliar with the Spiral tradition.

The eastern acceptance of the Flying Gallop is probably best explained, apart from artistic usefulness, by novelty appeal. Neither the Egyptian nor the Mesopotamian traditions had anything like it. Still, both had managed for over a millennium without noticing the lack. However it appears that when eastern artists were confronted with the spirited pose they recognized its possibilities and accepted the Aegean motif. For a relatively short span in the Late Bronze Age the Flying Gallop is employed and after that the old static poses eventually prevail. With these few cases of acceptance it is likely to be the instant appeal of the design and the novelty of the pose which recommends itself to a specialized clientele. For the original Aegean creation what source of inspiration can be found?<sup>11</sup> Perhaps the creatures of the sea inspired this convention for swift movement as they inspired so many other original Minoan motifs. The flashing leap of flying fish or dolphin is after all a kind of "marine flying gallop" or "flying leap".

---

11. Above pp. 107-8.

The last group of motifs to raise the question of the acceptance and rejection is that list of minor motifs, those detailed features taken out of the larger compositions and themes of Chapter 4. These are the motifs like the Siege Scene with Falling Warrior and the Cat Catching Wildfowl and some chariot scene details. With these examples it is very clear that it is the motif which is the unit of transference, and when artistic exchange between East and West is considered it appears that for this list of minor motifs there is no countermanding symbolism. Either there is no symbolism at all, as with the Lion and the Cattle Hide convention, or the symbolism can be very easily divorced from the motif, as when the Woman Smelling a Lotus becomes simply a pretty picture of a Woman Smelling a Flower. These points together with the point of sheer artistic usefulness would provide sufficient reason for their acceptance. Doubtless the Aegean artists, confronted with such a bewildering array of subject matter as that contained in the eastern compositions of Ritual and the Gods, of animal life and symbolic representations of war, found most of it alien and impenetrable, and seized upon any small features in the compositions that were both intelligible and decorative. This would certainly explain why often only very small features indeed are taken up and transferred west as for example, the Cat Catching Wildfowl motif.

The discussion of the acceptance and rejection of motifs calls to attention some gaps in the Aegean repertoire that the Minoans and Mycenaeans sought never to fill. The first has already been mentioned and is the lack of any greatly developed iconography for the gods. The second is the complete absence of farming scenes. The third also previously mentioned, is a partial gap but nevertheless surprising, and that is, even counting the Thera fresco, the very few representations of

Aegean ships. Certainly for the last two at least the Aegeans could have followed Egyptian models had they wanted. Perhaps it is partly explained by Aegean art being a largely court-commissioned art, at least for the rich pieces and frescoes, and Minoan and Mycenaean lords did not desire to have themselves depicted as farmers or traders or even as being interested in farming or trading though there is no doubt their palace archives kept a close record of all farming activities and their palace workshops produced many of the items destined for overseas markets. Finally the only deduction one can make from the contrast between the absence of depiction of Minoan soldiers and the prevalence of Mycenaean war scenes is that the Minoans did not choose to represent themselves as warriors and the Mycenaeans did.<sup>12</sup>

The investigations of the reasons for the acceptance of some motifs, the rejection of others, provides two interesting insights into Minoan and Mycenaean art, and Bronze Age art in general. Firstly, some motifs are accepted for their artistic usefulness. These are the decorative patterns, the motifs without symbolism, and the artistic design principles, the motifs of method. Secondly, some motifs are accepted or rejected by Aegean art depending on whether their symbolism is compatible with Minoan and Mycenaean culture or not. Where motifs are accepted the very changes made in their iconography to Aegeanize them show a high level of cognizance with the original usage of the motif in its home tradition, and where motifs are rejected they are equally as striking in design, as popular in their own traditions, and as potent in their symbolism as any of the motifs accepted.<sup>13</sup> The only

---

12. The Minoans of Crete may or may not have gone to war. The Hittites were famous in battle but chose to represent themselves in their art as pious worshippers of their Gods!

13. Or even more so. See above Chapters 3 and 4.

possible conclusion is that Aegean art accepts only those motifs whose symbolism strikes a chord in the Mycenaean consciousness or the Minoan before it, and neither the striking nature of the design, nor the popularity of the motif in its own tradition, can force on the Aegean a motif which is symbolically incompatible.

## Conclusion

### 10 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The evidence presented by the detailed investigation of *Part I* argues for some exchange of motifs and provides some explanations of motif behaviour when this exchange occurs. The value of *Part I*, the iconographical analysis of the motifs, is not however restricted to providing this evidence. *Part I* has an intrinsic merit because it has assembled a large corpus of ancient art for comparative studies,<sup>1</sup> and has attempted a systematic iconographical classification<sup>2</sup> of this considerable body of material by refining and adapting the tool of artistic enquiry, iconographical analysis, for research into ancient art.<sup>3</sup>

In attempting to determine whether the common usage of motifs can be attributed to indigenous creation or to artistic exchange, one

- 
1. Over five hundred pieces are illustrated and a great number of additional pieces are referred to in the text and footnotes. All of this material is considered artistically, not, as is so often the case, listed as archaeological data or used as evidence to establish chronologies or to verify some historical point.
  2. Previous attempts to devise an adequate terminology were confined to one or two motifs or limited to describing seal designs. Many authors preferred to use their own terminologies. The systematic terminology produced here provides a substantial base for a comprehensive terminology for the motifs of the ancient traditions.
  3. Particularly in regard to respecting the objectivity of the method which is based on precise observable artistic detail, above pp. 8-9.

has had to be evermindful of the limitations of the source material<sup>4</sup> and the complexity of the issues of intercommunications in the ancient world.<sup>5</sup> Notwithstanding these problems it has still been possible to pursue the investigation and to arrive at the following results.

Transference of motifs is argued on the grounds of coincidence of iconographical detail for all the motifs of highly specialized subject matter where there are sufficient examples to make a case. The iconography strongly argues transference from the East to the Aegean for Heraldic Poses, the Antithetical Group, Mirror Reverse, Master of Animals, Mistress of Animals, Sphinx, Griffin, Thueris, and Animals at the Tree of Life. Motifs which are transferred from the Aegean to the East are four elaborate Spiral designs and the Flying Gallop.<sup>6</sup>

The iconography slightly less strongly argues that Dragons, Crocodiles and the Tree-watering Ritual transferred from the East to the Aegean because there is a lower level of correspondence of iconographical detail.<sup>7</sup>

- 
4. For the art historian working in the field of artistic exchange some of the gaps are particularly serious. One would wish to know what secrets the mounds of Thebes in Greece and Aleppo in Syria still keep hidden, and where one could find the capital of the Mitannians. The equivalent of the Byblos tombs for each later period in Syria would help greatly, as would the finding of more hoards like the Shaft Graves gold and the Megiddo ivories, more metal work, more palaces standing in Syria, Egypt, and the Aegean. Perhaps one of the most serious disadvantages for this study of motifs has been the loss of perishable goods like fabrics, patterned in the weave, perhaps embroidered as well. Some of these gaps in the survey of Minoan and Mycenaean seals in the CMS volumes will be covered by future publication. Some, like the fabrics, can never be restored and the loss will always limit the understanding of the artistic connections.
  5. It would be very easy to oversimplify the issues involved. To summarize the timing and avenue of the transference of each motif is difficult, let alone to give an overall summation of the whole migration phenomenon. This one example serves to highlight the complexities inherent in every aspect of this investigation.
  6. Above pp. 156-62.
  7. Above pp. 160-1.

Transference of motifs is not generally argued for the motifs of common objects, flora and fauna, and for themes of universal interest to man. These comprise the Palm, Palmette, Papyrus, Rosette, Quatrefoil, Scale Pattern Guilloche, Linked Circles, Quirk, the conventions for the Human Figure and Border patterns, and the themes of War, Hunt, and the Chariot, Ritual and the Gods, Animals, Bucrania and Ships. The only exception in this group is the Lion motif which must be allowed to transfer, at least to Minoan art, on the grounds that the lion cannot be considered part of the indigenous fauna of Crete.<sup>8</sup>

However there are tricks of rendering features, and smaller compositional elements separated out from larger designs, where the coincidence of iconographical detail does suggest artistic borrowing and not indigenous growth. In this category are some of the decorative variants of the Palm and Palmette and some of the decorative and naturalistic renderings of the Papyrus, which may have been taken over by Aegean art from the eastern traditions; some Aegean usages of Double Rosettes, Rosette Borders and Rosette-studded spiraliform designs that may have penetrated into the eastern arts; and some details of the Quatrefoil, Scale Pattern, Guilloche, Linked Circles and Quirk which may mean mutual borrowings.<sup>9</sup> Somewhat clearer examples are the motifs of the Woman Smelling a Flower, the Falling Warrior, the Cat Catching Wildfowl and the Cattle Hide convention which may have come from Egypt to the Aegean, and the spirited Chariot compositions and some poses of bulls and attacking animals that may have gone from the Aegean to the East.<sup>10</sup>

---

8. Above pp. 156-9, 166-7.

9. Above pp. 163-4.

10. Above pp. 164-8.



The motifs of Chapter 3 remain very much in their own traditions and the exceptional cases of their being found in other arts may represent sporadic motif transferences.<sup>11</sup>

The iconographical evidence of *Part I* indicates that the phenomenon of motif transference is known throughout the Bronze Age, beginning with the extension of Mesopotamian motifs to north Syria in the third millennium. The process has not been continuous but rather one of waxing and bursts and intermissions, though it is possible that the knowledge of interconnections never entirely disappeared even in times of great upheaval like the First Intermediate Period and the end of Early Bronze.<sup>12</sup> Of the four periods discussed, the first three, contemporaneous with the Pre-Palatial, Old Palace, and New Palace Periods of Crete give examples of motif transference in various areas, while the last, that contemporaneous with LHIIIA and IIIB, appears to be more one of motif sharing. In the waxing and waning phases of motif transference there are two which are most important for artistic exchange, the first c1850 to c1750 and the second, which is crucial to the Aegean, c1600 to c1500. In the first phase, the late 19th century saw the peak of Egyptian 12th Dynasty influence on Syria particularly at Byblos, and the beginnings of links with Crete, and the early 18th century, which could be called the Mari Era, saw connections between Mari and the Old Palaces of Crete via the north Syrian plain. In the c1600-c1500 phase, the connections were between Syria which now enjoined the Mitannian state, and Crete, Thera, and Mainland Greece, though a direct link between Syria and Mainland Greece should be allowed.<sup>13</sup> It

---

11. Above pp. 167-8.

12. Above p. 232.

13. Above pp. 176-8.

is important also to note the role of Syria in aiding motif transference at all periods, either as a participant in the process or as an intermediary.

The detailed investigation has also provided an explanation of motif behaviour once these transferences occur and of the nature of the motif itself. The motif is seen as the unit of transference, and as having a distinct identity of its own.<sup>14</sup> The transference of motifs and the continued use of motifs in their indigenous traditions provides, in the Late Bronze Age, a veritable pool of motifs which may be drawn on by the artists of the Aegean, Egypt, and Syria and Cyprus.<sup>15</sup> This pool of motifs is termed the International Repertoire and constitutes almost all those motifs in Chapter 2 and some details in Chapter 4, as well as some voluted foliate forms developed in Syria.<sup>16</sup> Minoan and Mycenaean art both contribute to, and participate in, the International Repertoire.

Consideration of how the transferring motifs are used by the adoptive art permits the conclusion that there are two levels of acceptance. The foreign motif may penetrate the indigenous style to the level of the Intrusive Element, where the motif retains much of its foreign character appearing as an insertion in the local composition, or to the level of Incorporated Element where the foreign motif is changed and adapted until it is integrated into the national style.<sup>17</sup> This latter level is the most significant as it marks a considerable acceptance of the foreign motif by the adoptive art. Some national

---

14. Above pp. 169-70.

15. Above pp. 170-1.

16. Above pp. 170, 196-7.

17. Above pp. 181-4, 185-8.

styles have been shaped by this full assimilation of foreign motifs more than by any other single factor.<sup>18</sup> It is also most important to note that twelve of the major motifs have reached the level of Incorporated Element in Aegean art, a level which makes them more migrating than transferring motifs.<sup>19</sup>

The term International Style has been invoked to classify certain exceptional pieces of the Late Bronze Age that are small, costly, and finely wrought. They carry such an integrated design that they demand the acknowledgement of being worked in a "style" but they cannot be surely identified as any national product since Aegean, Egyptian, and Syrian elements are all present. The usage of the term International Style proposed here is more restrictive than its previous usage and the postulation of two sub-styles is necessary to encompass all the pieces, the Ornate International Style and the Severe International Style. It cannot be ascertained where the International Style was created, though the motif analysis undertaken here would suggest a more important role for the Aegean than has previously been allowed. On artistic grounds it is proposed that when the florid, exuberant Syrian influence is uppermost, the Ornate Style is produced, and that the Mycenaean contribution to the development of the Severe Style is the legacy of highly articulated organization and a certain restraint in the number of motifs applied to a piece.<sup>20</sup>

With the terms International Repertoire, National Styles with Intrusive or Incorporated Elements, and the International Style Ornate and Severe, it is possible to provide a classification for all examples of artistic interrelations in the Late Bronze Age.

---

18. Above pp. 189-95.

19. Above pp. 156-62.

20. Above pp. 201-5.

The recognition of an International Repertoire and International Styles calls also for the recognition of the role the great cities play in developing this internationalism in art. It is of the nature of a metropolis that it provides a set of conditions that is conducive to the production of high quality art. The city has a wealthy elite to act as patron, a concentration of expertise to produce the art, and a mingling of various nationalities in the city trade centre to provide further stimulus to the international outlook. Throughout the art discussions many such eastern cities have been mentioned - Mari, Byblos, Alalakh, Ugarit, Thebes, Amarna.<sup>21</sup> The role performed by the great cities of the East was performed in the Aegean by the palace complexes - Knossos, Phaestos, Mallia, Mycenae, Pylos, Thebes.<sup>22</sup> In the discussion of the importance of Syria for the transference of artistic motifs, the cities of Byblos and Mari were noted particularly in connection with the crucial period c1850 to c1750. That century of intercommunications seems to be a fore-shadowing of the more extensive inter-relations of the Late Bronze Age, seen most clearly in cities like Ugarit. The International Repertoire and the International Style belong to an International Age.<sup>23</sup>

The artistic enquiries have also led to the consideration of two allied cultural questions, the means by which motifs are transferred, and the reasons for the acceptance of some motifs but the rejection of others. In both these areas the answers suggested are by nature more speculative than any of the proposals on the iconographical issues, since in the one case the imperfect sources for inter-relations in the

---

21. Above pp. 171-80.

22. Above pp. 227-8.

23. Above pp. 196-244.

ancient world limit the deductions,<sup>24</sup> and in the other there must be a departure from the objective observation of precise artistic detail into the more subjective realms of meaning and symbolism.<sup>25</sup>

The means of motif transference, in descending order of the accuracy of the resulting design, are the skill of the craftsman including the transference of technology, the copy of the direct import, and the commission to local artists of the traveller returning home and relying on his memory of things seen in foreign lands. In all these, the mobility of the personnel is a key factor and the ancient records list many people who move because of their work, even sometimes giving their names, merchants, traders, couriers, officials, administrators and the travelling craftsman himself. Then there are the larger groups of people who move to new lands, invaders, prisoners of war, or refugees from some natural or man-made disaster. It has also been seen that the decisions of the monarch vitally concern the mobility of the personnel in these international relations. As the patron of arts or the sponsor of trade, as the invading warrior or the administrator of conquered territories, as the letter writer and gift giver and collector, the king has a profound effect on intercommunication in the ancient world. The contracting of dynastic marriages is not the least in effect of all his decisions.<sup>26</sup>

On the question of why the Minoans and Mycenaeans accepted some motifs from the East but rejected others, and why the East assimilated two Aegean motifs but no more, it was soon seen that neither the widespread use in the home tradition, nor the striking

---

24. Above pp. 222-44 for a brief survey of evidence for inter-relations in the Bronze Age. A full treatment of the source material for this subject lies outside the scope of this enquiry.

25. Above pp. 245-60.

26. Above pp. 222-44.

artistic quality, nor the potency of symbolism were sufficient reasons for transference. Two criteria for transference are proposed, the criterion of artistic usefulness which covers the motifs of method, organizational motifs and the purely decorative designs, and the criterion of compatibility of the symbolism, which covers most of the major motifs in the migrating group. The criteria appear to be valid for both the Aegean acceptance and rejection and the eastern acceptance and rejection of motifs. If the reasons for transference are interpreted correctly, and it appears that no other conclusion can be drawn from the iconographical analysis, then a high level of cognizance among the Aegean peoples of the artistic symbolism of the old traditions must be acknowledged.<sup>27</sup>

Perhaps concern will be expressed that this work has made no reference to Greek literature or myth, but it has been a deliberate choice not to use either. Contemporary documents, Linear B texts, Hittite archives, and Egyptian and Mesopotamian records, are drawn upon but the wealth of later Greek myth and literature has been set aside because their relatively late date of recording sets up too many problems about reliability and because of the danger of the circular argument where the art pieces are used to prove the myths and the myths are used to explain the art pieces. It suffices to comment that there is much in this exposition, in these arguments and proposals, that would complement the myths, even a few points to add to Stubbings' discussion of Mycenaean expansion.<sup>28</sup> Michael Astour may have on the whole over-argued his case for West Semitic settlement in the Aegean<sup>29</sup> but this

---

27. Above pp. 259-60.

28. STUBBINGS (1973) pp. 634-8.

29. ASTOUR (1967).

work has come to one or two similar conclusions independently, relying on the artistic evidence. Nevertheless, though one must agree with Emily Vermeule when she says of Homer, "He is every Mycenaean scholar's passion",<sup>30</sup> one must resolutely set Homer, later literature, and the myths aside and argue the case solely from the artistic, the historical and the archaeological record.

The aim of this thesis was to investigate the artistic phenomenon that, in the Bronze Age, many motifs were used in common by the arts of the Aegean, Egypt, and the Near East, and it has been possible to determine that in some cases the common usage can be attributed to indigenous creation while in others it is due to artistic exchange. In addition, arguments and proposals have been provided which help set Aegean art in true perspective against the artistic traditions of Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age, and show Minoan and Mycenaean art as participating fully in the internationalism in art in the Late Bronze Age.

---

30. VERM Introduction p. X. She rejected Homer as evidence, "with a pang".

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AKURGAL, E. (1962) *The Art of the Hittites*.  
 (1968) *The Birth of Greek Art*.
- ALBRIGHT, W. F. (1945) An Indirect Synchronism between Egypt and Mesopotamia, cir. 1730 B.C., *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 99, pp. 9-18.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ and MORAN, W. L. (1948) A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA82), *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2, pp. 239-48.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1952a) A Note on the Chronology of the Second Millennium B.C., *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 126, pp. 24-6.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1952b) Further Observations on the Chronology of the Early Second Millennium B.C., *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 127, pp. 27-30.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1957) Further Observations on the Chronology of Alalakh, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 146, pp. 26-34.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1959) Dunand's New Byblos Volume: A Lycian at the Byblian Court, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 155, pp. 31-4.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1961) Abram the Hebrew - A New Archaeological Interpretation, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 163, pp. 36-54.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1964) The Eighteenth Century Princes of Byblos and the Chronology of Middle Bronze, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 176, pp. 38-46.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1965) Further Light on the History of Middle Bronze Byblos, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 179, pp. 38-43.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) The Historical Framework of Palestinian Archaeology between 2100 and 1600 B.C. (E.B.IV, M.B.I., M.B.IIA-B), *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 209, pp. 12-18.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) The Amarna Letters from Palestine, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 20.
- ALDRED, C. (1968) *Akhenaten*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) The Foreign Gifts Offered to Pharaoh, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56, pp. 105-16.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) *Jewels of the Pharaohs*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) Egypt: The Amarna Period and the End of the Eighteenth Dynasty, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 19.
- ALEXANDER, R. L. (1975) A Hittite Cylinder Seal in the Fitzwilliam Museum, *Anatolian Studies* 25, pp. 111-17.
- AMIET, P. (1961) *La Glyptique Mésopotamienne Archaïque*.
- AMIRAN, R. (1965) Yanik Tepe, Shengavit, and the Khirbet Kerak Ware, *Anatolian Studies* 15, pp. 165-7.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1969) *Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) More about the Vounous Jar - Some EB IV Antecedents, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 210, pp. 63-6.
- ANDREWS, P.B.S. (1955) The Mycenaean Name of the Land of the Achaians, *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 56, pp. 1-19.



- ARIK, R. O. (1935) *Les Fouilles d'Alaca Hoyuk 1935*.
- ARKELL, A. J. (1948) The Shoulder Ornament of Near Eastern Lions, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 7, p. 52.
- ARTZY, M., PERLMAN, I., and ASARO, F. (1976) Alasiya of the Amarna Letters, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 35, pp. 171-82.
- ASTOUR, M. C. (1965) New Evidence on the Last Days of Ugarit, *American Journal of Archaeology* 69, pp. 253-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966) Aegean Place-Names in an Egyptian Inscription, *American Journal of Archaeology* 70, pp. 313-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967) *Hellenosemitica*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1972) Hattusilis, Halab, and Hanigalbat, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 31, pp. 102-9.
- ASTROM, P. (1966) *Excavations at Kalopsidha and Ayios Iakovos in Cyprus*.
- ATKINSON, T. D., CROWFOOT, J. W., EDGAR, C. C., BOSANQUET, R. C., MACKENZIE, D., and SMITH, G. (1904) *Excavations at Phylakopi in Melos* (*Journal of Hellenic Studies Supplement* 4).
- BARNETT, R. D. (1956) Phoenicia and the Ivory Trade, *Archaeology* 9, pp. 87-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) The Sea Peoples, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 28.
- BARRELET, M. T. (1952) A propos d'une plaquette trouvée à Mari, *Syria* 29, pp. 285-93.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1955) Les Déesses armées et ailées, *Syria* 32, pp. 223-260, Pl. 21.
- BASS, G. F. (1961) The Cape Gelidonya Wreck, *American Journal of Archaeology* 65, pp. 267-76, Pls. 83-90.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963) Mycenaean and Protogeometric Tombs in the Halicarnassus Peninsula, *American Journal of Archaeology* 67, pp. 353-61, Pls. 81-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967) *Cape Gelidonya: A Bronze Age Shipwreck*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) A Hoard of Trojan and Sumerian Jewelry, *American Journal of Archaeology* 74, pp. 335-41, Pls. 85-6.
- BATE, D.M.A. (1950) The "Shoulder Ornament" of Near Eastern Lions, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 9, pp. 53-4, Pl. 2.
- BENSON, J. L. (1961) Observations on Mycenaean Vase-Painters, *American Journal of Archaeology* 65, pp. 337-47, Pls. 101-9.
- BERAN, T. (1967) *Die Hethitische Glyptik von Bogazkoy I*.
- BETANCOURT, P. P. (1970) The Maikop Copper Tools and their Relationship to Cretan Metallurgy, *American Journal of Archaeology* 74, pp. 351-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and WEINSTEIN, G. A. (1976) Carbon-14 and the Beginning of the Late Bronze Age in the Aegean, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 80, pp. 329-48.
- BETTS, J. H. (1965) Notes on a Possible Minoan Forgery, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 60, pp. 203-6, Pl. 55.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966) The Vapheio Gems: A Note of Clarification, *American Journal of Archaeology* 70, pp. 368-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967) Some Unpublished Knossos Sealings and Sealstones, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 62, pp. 27-45.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) Dating Sealstones in LM/LH, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 15, p. 142 (Mycenaean Seminar).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) Late Minoan-Mycenaean Gem Workshops, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 23, pp. 122-3 (Mycenaean Seminar).

- BETTS, J. H. and GREEN, J. R. (1964) Some Levanto-Helladic Krater Fragments in the Otago Museum, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 11, pp. 70-2.
- BIROT, M. (1973) Nouvelles Découvertes épigraphiques au Palais de Mari (Salle 115), *Syria* 50, pp. 1-11.
- BISI, M. (1965) *Il Grifone*.
- BISSON DE LA ROQUE, F., CONTENAU, G., and CHAPOUTHIER, F. (1953) *Le Trésor de Tod*.
- BITTEL, K. (1976) The Great Temple of Hattusha-Bogazkoy, *American Journal of Archaeology* 80, pp. 66-73.
- BLAZQUEZ, J. M. (1972) Ivoires minoens et mycéniens, *Minos* 12, pp. 398-417.
- BLEGEN, C. W. (1937) *Prosymna*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1949) Hyria, *Hesperia Supplement* 8, pp. 39-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1962) The Mycenaean Age: The Trojan War, The Dorian Invasion, and Other Problems, *University of Cincinnati Ancient History Pamphlets* 4, pp. 1-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and RAWSON, M. (1966) *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Vol. I The Buildings and their Contents*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971a) The Identification of Troy, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 18.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971b) Troy III-IV-V, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 24(a).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973a) Troy VI, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 15.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) Troy VII, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 21(c).
- \_\_\_\_\_ RAWSON, M., TAYLOUR, W. LORD, DONOVAN, W. P. (1973b) *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Vol. III Acropolis and Lower Town, Tholoi, Grave Circle, and Chamber Tombs Discoveries outside the Citadel*.
- BOARDMAN, J. (1967) The Khaniale Tekke Tombs, II, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 62, pp. 57-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) Bronze Age Greece and Libya, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 63, pp. 40-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970a) Greek Gems and Finger Rings.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970b) Cypriot Finger Rings, *Bulletin of the British School at Athens* 65, pp. 5-15, Pls. 2-6.
- BOSSE-GRIFFITHS, K. (1973) The Great Enchantress in the Little Golden Shrine of Tutankhamun, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 59, pp. 100-8, Pls. 35-6.
- BOSSERT, H. T. (1946) *Asia*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1951) *Altsyrien*.
- BOTTERO, J. (1971) Syria and Palestine c2160-1780 B.C. Relations with Mesopotamia, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 21.
- BRAIDWOOD, R. J. and L. S. (1960) *Excavations in the Plain of Antioch I*.
- BRANIGAN, K. (1966) Byblite Daggers in Cyprus and Crete, *American Journal of Archaeology* 70, pp. 123-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967) The Early Bronze Age Daggers of Crete, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 62, pp. 211-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968a) Copper and Bronze Working in Early Bronze Age Crete.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968b) A Transitional Phase in Minoan Metallurgy, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 63, pp. 185-203.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969) Early Aegean Hoards of Metalwork, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 64, pp. 1-11.

- BRANIGAN, K. (1970a) *The Tombs of Mesara*.  
 (1970b) *The Foundations of Palatial Crete*.
- BRAUDEL, F. (1973) *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, Vols. I and II.
- BREASTED, J. H. (1962) *Ancient Records of Egypt Vols. I-V*.
- BRIDGES, R. A. (1974) The Mycenaean Tholos Tomb at Kolophon, *Hesperia* 43, pp. 264-6, Pl. 52.
- BRINKMAN, J. A. (1972) Foreign Relations of Babylonia from 1600 to 625 BC: The Documentary Evidence (summary), *American Journal of Archaeology* 76, pp. 271-81.
- BRONEER, O. (1948) What Happened at Athens, *American Journal of Archaeology* 52, pp. 111-14.  
 (1966) The Cyclopean Wall on the Isthmus of Corinth and its Bearing on Late Bronze Age Chronology, *Hesperia* 35, pp. 346-62, Pls. 80-4.
- BRYCE, T. R. (1974a) The Lukka Problem - and a Possible Solution, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33, pp. 395-404.  
 (1974b) Some Geographical and Political Aspects of Mursilis' Arzawan Campaign, *Anatolian Studies* 24, pp. 103-16.
- BUCHANAN, B. (1954) The Cow and Calf, *American Journal of Archaeology* 58, p. 144.  
 (1966) *Catalogue of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum Vol. I Cylinder Seals*.  
 (1968) A Cypriote Cylinder at Yale (Newell Collection 358), *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellinique* 92, pp. 410-15.  
 (1972) An Extraordinary Seal Impression of the Third Dynasty of Ur, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 31, pp. 96-101.
- BUCHHOLZ, H-G. and KARAGEORGHIS, V. (1973) *Prehistoric Greece and Cyprus*.
- BUCK, R. J. (1966) Middle Helladic Mattpainted Pottery, *Hesperia* 35, pp. 231-303, Pls. 39-44.
- BURTON-BROWN, T. (1948) 1600-1400 B.C. in the Eastern Mediterranean, *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 28, pp. 8-26.  
 (1959) *Early Mediterranean Migrations*.
- CADOGAN, G. (1966) An Egyptian Flint Knife from Knossos, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 61, pp. 147-8, Pl. 28b.  
 (1969a) Mycenaean Trade, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 16, pp. 152-4 (Mycenaean Seminar).  
 (1969b) Evidence for the Minoans outside Crete, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 16, pp. 157-8 (Proceedings of the British Association for Mycenaean studies).  
 (1972) Cypriot Objects in the Bronze Age Aegean and their Importance, in KARAGEORGHIS, V. (ed.), *Acts of the First International Congress of Cypriot Studies*, pp. 5-13.  
 (1973) Patterns in the Distribution of Mycenaean Pottery in the East Mediterranean, in KARAGEORGHIS, V. (ed.), *The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean*, pp. 156-74.  
 (1976) *Palaces of Minoan Crete*.
- HARRISON, R. K. and STRONG, G. E. (1972) Volcanic Glass Shards in Late Minoan I Crete, *Antiquity* 46, pp. 310-13.
- CAMERON, M.A.S. (1968) Unpublished Paintings from the 'House of the Frescoes' at Knossos, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 63, pp. 1-32, Pls. 1-8, A, B.

- CAMERON, M.A.S. (1970) New Restorations of Minoan Frescoes from Knossos, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 17, pp. 163-6 (Mycenaean Seminar).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) The Lady in Red: A Complementary Figure to the Ladies in Blue, *Archaeology* 24, pp. 35-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_ JONES, R.E., and PHILIPPAKIS, S. E. (1977) Scientific Analyses of Minoan Fresco Samples from Knossos, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 72, pp. 121-84.
- CANBY, J. V. (1971) Some Hittite Figurines in the Aegean, *Hesperia* 38, pp. 141-9, Pls. 38-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) The Walters Gallery Cappadocian Tablet and the Sphinx in Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C., *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 34, pp. 225-48.
- CARRATELLI, P. G. (1960) 'Il Re di Ahhiyawa' nel Trattato di Tudhaliyas IV con Istarmuwa, *Parola del Passato* 74, pp. 321-5.
- CARTER, H. and MACE, A. C. (1923, 27, 33) *The Tomb of Tutankhamun Vols. I-III.*
- CASKEY, J. L. (1960) Royal Shaft Graves at Lerna, *Archaeology* 13, pp. 130-3.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966) Excavations in Keos, 1964-65, *Hesperia* 35, pp. 363-76, Pls. 85-90.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) Greece, Crete, and the Aegean Islands in the Early Bronze Age, *Cambridge History I*, Ch. 26(a).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) Greece and the Aegean Islands in the Middle Bronze Age, *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 4(a).
- CASSIRER, M. (1959) A Scarab with an Early Representation of Resheph, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 45, pp. 6-7, Pl. 1.
- CASSON, L. (1959) *The Ancient Mariners.*
- CATLING, H. W. (1964) *Cypriot Bronzework in the Mycenaean World.*
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) Kouklia: Evreti Tomb 8, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 92, pp. 162-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) Cyprus in the Early Bronze Age, *Cambridge Ancient History I*, Ch. 26(b).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) Cyprus in the Middle Bronze Age, *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 4(c).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975a) Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age, *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 22(b).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975b) Archaeology in Greece 1974-75, Central Greece, *Archaeological Reports* 21, pp. 17-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) Archaeology in Greece 1975-76, Melos, *Archaeological Reports* 22, pp. 25-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and KARAGEORGHIS, V. (1960) Minoika in Cyprus, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 55, pp. 108-27, Pls. 25-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_ RICHARDS, E. E., and BLINSTOYLE, A. E. (1963) Correlations between Composition and Provenance of Mycenaean and Minoan Pottery, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 58, pp. 94-115, Pls. 28-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and MILLET, A. (1965) A Study in the Composition Patterns of Mycenaean Pictorial Pottery from Cyprus, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 60, pp. 212-24, Pls. 58-61.
- CHADWICK, J. (1973) The Linear Scripts and the Tablets as Historical Documents (b) The Linear B Tablets as Historical Documents, *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 13.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) *The Mycenaean World.*

- CHAPOUTHIER, F. (1951) De l'Origine du Prisme triangulaire dans la Clyptique minoenne, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 46, pp. 42-4.
- CHARLES, R.-P. (1965) Note sur un Scarabée égyptien de Pérati (Attique), *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 89, pp. 10-14.
- CHITTENDEN, J. (1947) The Master of Animals, *Hesperia* 16, pp. 89-113, Pls. 15-21.
- COHEN, L. (1938) Evidence for the Ram in the Minoan Period, *American Journal of Archaeology* 42, pp. 486-94.
- COLDSTREAM, J. N. (1969) The Thera Eruption: Some Thoughts on the Survivors, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 16, pp. 150-2 (Mycenaean Seminar).
- \_\_\_\_\_ and HUXLEY, G. L. (eds.) (1972) *Kythera*.
- COLEMAN, K. (1973) Frescoes from Ayia Irini, Keos, *Hesperia* 42, pp. 284-300, Pls. 54-8.
- COLLON, D. (1972) The Smiting God, A Study of a Bronze in the Pomerance Collection in New York, *Levant* 4, pp. 111-34.
- CROSSLAND, R. A. (1971) Immigrants from the North, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 27.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and BIRCHALL, A. (ed.) (1973) *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean*.
- CULICAN, W. (1966) *The First Merchant Venturers*.
- DANMANVILLE, J. (1969) La Collection Thierry V Bronzes syriens et anatoliens, *Revue Hittite et Asianique* 84-85, pp. 50-60.
- DAVARAS, C. (1969) Trois Bronzes minoen de Skoteino, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 93, pp. 620-50, Pls. 11-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) Early Minoan Jewellery from Mochlos, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 70, pp. 101-14, Pls. 15-22.
- DAVIES, N. de G. (1922) *The Tomb of Puyemre at Thebes*, Vols. I-II.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1925) *The Tomb of Two Sculptors at Thebes*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1927) *Two Ramesside Tombs at Thebes*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1930) *The Tomb of Kenamun at Thebes*, Vols. I-II.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1930a) *The Tomb of Nefer-Hotep at Thebes*, Vols. I-II.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1941) *The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1948) *Seven Private Tombs at Kurnah*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Nina (1933b) *The Tombs of Menkheperasonb, Amenmose, and Another*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and FAULKNER, R. O. (1947) A Syrian Trading Venture to Egypt, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33, pp. 40-6, Pl. 8.
- DAVIES, Nina de G. (1926) *The Tomb of Huy*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1936) *Ancient Egyptian Paintings* Vols. I-III.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1951) *The Tomb of Amenemhet* (No. 82).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963) *Scenes from Some Theban Tombs*.
- DAVIS, E. N. (1977) *The Vaphio Cups and Aegean Gold and Silver Ware*.
- DE CONTENSON, H. (1963) New Correlations between Ras Shamra and Al-'Amuq, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 172, pp. 35-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_ COURTOIS, J.-C., LAGARCE, E., LAGARCE, J., and STUCKY, R. (1974) La XXXIVe Campagne de Fouilles à Ras Shamra en 1973 Rapport préliminaire, *Syria* 51, pp. 1-29, Pls. 1-2.
- DEMARGNE, P. (1946) Un Prêtre oriental sur une Gemme crétoise du MR I, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 70, pp. 148-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1964) *Aegean Art*.
- DESBOROUGH, V.R. d'A. (1972) *The Greek Dark Ages*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) *The End of Mycenaean Civilization and the Dark Age* (a) The Archaeological Background, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 36.

- DESROCHES-NOBLECOURT, C. (1963) *Life and Death of a Pharaoh, Tutankhamen*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) La Cueillette du Raisin à la Fin de l'Epoque amarnienne, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 54, pp. 82-8, Pl. 14.
- DESSENNE, A. (1949) Têtes minoennes, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 73, pp. 307-15.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1957a) Le Sphinx.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1957b) Le Griffon créto - mycénien, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 81, pp. 203-11.
- DE VAUX, R. (1971) Palestine in the Early Bronze Age, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 15.
- DIAMANT, S. and RUTTER, J. (1969) Horned Objects in Anatolia and the Near East and Possible Connexions with the Minoan "Horns of Consecration", *Anatolian Studies* 19, pp. 147-77.
- DI CESNOLA, L. P. (1885-1903) *A Descriptive Atlas of the Cesnola Collection of Cypriote Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, Vols. 1-3.
- DICKINSON, O.T.P.K. (1977) *The Origins of Mycenaean Civilisation*.
- DOSSIN, G. (1973) Une Mention de Cananéens dans une Lettre de Mari, *Syria* 50, pp. 277-82.
- DOUMAS, C. (1974) The Minoan Eruption of the Santorini Volcano, *Antiquity* 48, pp. 110-15.
- DOW, S. (1954) Minoan Writing, *American Journal of Archaeology* 58, pp. 77-129, Pls. 15-17.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) The Linear Scripts and the Tablets as Historical Documents (a) Literacy in Minoan and Mycenaean Lands, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 13.
- DROWER, M. S. (1973) Syria c1550-1400 B.C., *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 10.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) Ugarit, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 21(b).  
 \_\_\_\_\_ and BOTTERO, J. (1971) Syria before 2200 B.C., *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 17.
- DUNAND, M. (1954) *Fouilles de Byblos Tome II 1933-38*.
- DUSSAUD, R. (1949) *L'Art Phénicien du II<sup>e</sup> Millénaire*.
- ECCLES, E. (1939-40) Unpublished Objects from Palaikastro and Praesos 6. The Seals and Sealings, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 40, pp. 43-50.
- EDEL, E. (1974) Assouan: Qubbet el-Hawa, pp. 201-2 in LECLANT, J., *Fouilles et travaux en Egypte et au Soudan 1972-3, Orientalia* 43, pp. 171-227.
- EDWARDS, I.E.S. (1971) The Early Dynastic Period in Egypt, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 11.
- ELLIS, R. S. and BUCHANAN, B. (1966) An Old Babylonian Gameboard with Sculptured Decoration, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 25, pp. 192-201, Pl. 17.
- ERICH, R. W. (ed.) (1965) *Chronologies in Old World Archaeology*.
- EVANS, A. J. (1892-3) A Mykenaeen Treasure from Aegina, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 13, pp. 195-226.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1901) *The Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1921-35) *The Palace of Minos at Knossos Vols. I-IV*.
- EVANS, J. (1972) The Early Minoan Occupation of Knossos: A Note on Some New Evidence, *Anatolian Studies* 22, pp. 115-28.
- FAULKNER, R. O. (1946) The Euphrates Campaign of Tuthmosis III, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 32, pp. 39-42.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty to the Death of Ramesses III, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 23.

- FOX-DAVIES, A. C. (1909) *A Complete Guide to Heraldry* (Reprinted 1950).
- FRANKEN, H. J. (1975) Palestine in the Time of the Nineteenth Dynasty (b) Archaeological Evidence, *Cambridge History II*, Ch. 26.
- FRANKFORT, H. (1936-7) Notes on the Cretan Griffin, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 37, pp. 106-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1939) *Cylinder Seals* (Republished 1965).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1954) *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) The Last Predynastic Period in Babylonia, *Cambridge Ancient History I*, Ch. 12 (Revised and Re-arranged by L. DAVIES).
- FRANKLYN, J. (1967) *Shield and Crest*.
- FRASER, P. M. (1969) Archaeology in Greece, 1968-69, *Archaeological Reports* 15, pp. 3-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) Archaeology in Greece, 1970-71, *Archaeological Reports* 17, pp. 3-32.
- FRENCH, E. (1975) A Reassessment of the Mycenaean Pottery at Tarsus, *Anatolian Studies* 25, pp. 53-75.
- FURUMARK, A. (1941a) *The Mycenaean Pottery*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1941b) *The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1950) The Settlement at Ialysos and Aegean History c1550-1400 B.C., *Opuscula Archaeologica* 6, pp. 150-271.
- GABALLA, G. A. (1973) Three Documents from the Reign of Ramesses III, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 59, pp. 109-13, Pls. 37-8.
- GADD, C. J. (1971a) The Cities of Babylonia, *Cambridge Ancient History I*, Ch. 13.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971b) The Dynasty of Agade and the Gutian Invasion, *Cambridge Ancient History I*, Ch. 19.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971c) Babylonia c2120-1800 B.C., *Cambridge Ancient History I*, Ch. 22.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) Hammurabi and the End of his Dynasty, *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) Assyria and Babylon c1370-1300 B.C., *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 18.
- GARDINER, A. H. (1946) Davies Copy of the Great Speos Artemidos Inscription, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 32, pp. 43-56, Pl. 6.
- GARDINER, A. H. (1950) *Egyptian Grammar*.
- GARSTANG, J. and GURNEY, O. R. (1959) *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*.
- GELB, I. J. (1973) Prisoners of War in Early Mesopotamia, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32, pp. 70-98.
- GILES, F. J. (1970) Ikhnaton, Legend and History.
- GILL, M.A.V. (1961) Note on the Hagia Pelagia Cylinder, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 8, pp. 7-13, Pl. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963) The Minoan Dragon, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 10, pp. 1-12, Pls. 1-2.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1964) The Minoan Genius, *Athenische Mitteilungen* 79, pp. 1-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1965) The Knossos Sealings: Provenance and Identification, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 60, pp. 58-98, Pls. 5-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) Apropos the Minoan "Genius", *American Journal of Archaeology* 74, pp. 404-6.
- GOETZE, A. (1933) *Kleinasien*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1940) Kizzuwatna and the Problem of Hittite Geography.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1947) A New Letter from Ramesses to Hattusilis, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 1, pp. 241-52.

- GOETZE, A. (1951) The Problem of Chronology and Early Hittite History, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 122, pp. 18-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1952) The Date of the Hittite Raid on Babylon, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 127, pp. 21-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1957) Alalakh and Hittite Chronology, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 146, pp. 20-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968-9) The Predecessors of Suppiluliumas of Hatti and the Chronology of the Ancient Near East, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 22, pp. 46-50.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975a) The Struggle for the Domination of Syria (1400-1300 B.C.), *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 17.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975b) Anatolia from Shuppiluliumash to the Egyptian War of Muwatallish, *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 21(a).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975c) The Hittites and Syria (1300-1200 B.C.), *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 24.
- GOLDMAN, H. (1950-63) *Excavations at Gozlu Kule, Tarsus, Vols. 1-3.*
- GORDON, C. H. (1954) Ugarit and Caphtor, *Minos* 3, pp. 126-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956) Ugaritic Guilds and Homeric *Δημιουργοί*, in WEINBERG, S. S. (ed.), *The Aegean and the Near East*.
- GRACE, V. R. (1940) A Cypriote Tomb and Minoan Evidence for its Date, *American Journal of Archaeology* 44, pp. 10-52, Pls. 1-12.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956) The Canaanite Jar, in WEINBERG, S. S. (ed.), *The Aegean and the Near East*.
- GRAHAM, J. W. (1960) Mycenaean Architecture, *Archaeology* 13, pp. 46-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1962) *The Palaces of Crete.*
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) Egyptian Features at Phaistos, *American Journal of Archaeology* 74, pp. 231-9.
- GROENEWEGEN-FRANKFORT, H. A. (1951) *Arrest and Movement: An Essay on Space and Time in the Representational Art of the Ancient Near East.*
- GURNEY, O. R. (1973a) Anatolia c1750-1600 B.C., *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973b) Anatolia c1600-1380 B.C., *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 15.
- GUTERBOCK, H. G. (1936) Neue Ahhijava-Texte, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archaeologie* 43, pp. 321-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956) Notes on Some Hittite Monuments, *Anatolian Studies* 6, pp. 53-6, Pls. 3-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1957) Narration in Anatolian, Syrian, and Assyrian Art, *American Journal of Archaeology* 61, pp. 62-71, Pls. 21-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967) The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 26, pp. 73-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) Hittite Hieroglyphic Seal Impressions from Korucutepe, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32, pp. 135-47, Pls. 3-5.
- HAEVERNICK, T. E. (1963) Mycenaean Glass, *Archaeology* 16, pp. 190-3.
- HALL, H. R. (1903-4) The Keftiu - Fresco in the Tomb of Senmut, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 10, pp. 154-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1909-10) An Addition to the Senmut-Fresco, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 16, pp. 254-7, Frontispiece and Pl. 14.
- HAMMOND, N.G.L. (1967) Tumulus-Burial in Albania, The Grave Circles of Mycenae, and the Indo-Europeans, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 62, pp. 77-105.
- HANFMANN, G.M.A. (1948) Archaeology in Homeric Asia Minor, *American Journal of Archaeology* 52, pp. 135-55.



- HANKEY, V. (1966) Late Mycenaean Pottery at Beth-Shan, *American Journal of Archaeology* 70, pp. 169-71, Pl. 45.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967) Mycenaean Pottery in the Middle East: Notes on Finds since 1951, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 62, pp. 107-48, Pls. 26-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) Mycenaean Trade with the South-Eastern Mediterranean, *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 46, pp. 11-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1974) A Late Bronze Age Temple at Amman: I The Aegean Pottery, *Levant* 6, pp. 131-59.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and TUFNELL, O. (1973) The Tomb of Maket and its Mycenaean Import, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 68, pp. 103-12, Pl. 36.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and WARREN, P. (1974) The Absolute Chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 21, pp. 142-52 (Mycenaean Seminar).
- HANSEN, D. P. (1957) A Bronze in the Semitic Museum of Harvard University, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 146, pp. 13-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969) Some Remarks on the Chronology and Style of Objects from Byblos, *American Journal of Archaeology* 73, pp. 281-4.
- HARTNER, W. (1965) The Earliest History of the Constellations in the Near East and the Motif of the Lion-Bull Combat, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 24, pp. 1-16, Pls. 1-16.
- HAYES, W. C. (1953, 9) *The Scepter of Egypt Parts I and II*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) Chronology I. Egypt - to the End of the Twentieth Dynasty, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 6. (Reprinted 1976).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) The Middle Kingdom in Egypt, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 20.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973a) Egypt: From the Death of Ammenemes III to Sequenre II, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973b) Egypt: Internal Affairs from Tuthmosis I to the Death of Amenophis III, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 9.
- HAZZIDAKIS, J. (1921) *Tylissos à l'Epoque minoenne*.
- HEATH, M. C. (1958) Early Helladic Clay Sealings from the House of Tiles at Lerna, *Hesperia* 27, pp. 81-121, Pls. 19-29.
- HENNESSY, J. B. (1966) Excavation of a Late Bronze Age Temple at Amman, *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 98, pp. 155-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967) *The Foreign Relations of Palestine during the Early Bronze Age*.
- HIGGINS, R. A. (1956) The Archaeological Background to the Furniture Tablets from Pylos, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 3, pp. 39-44, Figs. 1-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1957) The Aigina Treasure Reconsidered, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 52, pp. 42-57, Pls. 9-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1961) *Greek and Roman Jewellery*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967) *Minoan and Mycenaean Art*.
- HOFFNER, H. A. (1968-9) A Hittite Text in Epic Style about Merchants, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 22, pp. 34-45.
- HOGARTH, D. G. (1910-11) Note on Two Zakro Sealings, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 17, pp. 264-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1914) *Carchemish Part I Introductory*.
- HOLLAND, L. B. (1929) Mycenaean Plumes, *American Journal of Archaeology* 33, pp. 173-205.
- HOOD, M.S.F. (1956) Another Warrior Grave at Ayios Ioannis near Knossos, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 51, pp. 81-99.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1960) Schliemann's Mycenae Albums, *Archaeology* 13, pp. 61-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) *The Minoans*.

- HOOD, M.S.F. (1973) The Destruction of Crete c1450 B.C., *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 20, pp. 151-3 (Mycenaean Seminar).
- \_\_\_\_\_ and De JONG, P. (1952) Late Minoan Warrior-Graves from Ayios Ioannis and the New Hospital Site at Knossos, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 47, pp. 243-77, Pls. 50-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and WARREN, P. (1966) Ancient Sites in the Province of Ayios Vasilios, Crete, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 61, pp. 163-91, Pls. 35-41.
- HOOKE, J. T. (1976) *Mycenaean Greece*.
- HOPE-SIMPSON, R. (1965) *A Gazetteer and Atlas of Mycenaean Sites*.
- HOPKINS, C. (1962) The Aegina Treasure, *American Journal of Archaeology* 66, pp. 182-4, Pls. 51-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963) A Review of the Throne Room at Cnossos, *American Journal of Archaeology* 67, pp. 416-9, Pls. 97-100.
- HORN, S. H. (1962) Scarabs from Shechem, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21, pp. 1-14, Pl. 1.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966) Scarabs and Scarab Impressions from Shechem - II, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 25, pp. 48-56, Pl. 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) Scarabs and Scarab Impressions from Shechem - III, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32, pp. 281-9.
- HUTCHINSON, R. W. and BOARDMAN, J. (1954) The Khaniala Tekke Tombs, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 49, pp. 215-28, Pls. 19-30.
- IAKOVIDES, S. E. (1969) *Perati Vols. 1-3*.
- IMMERWAHR, S. A. (1945) Three Mycenaean Vases from Cyprus in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, *American Journal of Archaeology* 49, pp. 534-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956) The Protome Painter and Some Contemporaries, *American Journal of Archaeology* 60, pp. 137-41, Pls. 52-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1960) Mycenaean Trade and Colonization, *Archaeology* 13, pp. 4-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966) The Use of Tin on Mycenaean Vases, *Hesperia* 35 pp. 381-96, Pls. 92-3.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) *The Athenian Agora Vol. XIII The Neolithic and Bronze Ages*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1977) Mycenaeans at Thera: Some Reflections on the Paintings from the West House, in KINZL, K. H. (ed.) *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory*.
- JAMES, T.G.H. (1973) Egypt: From the Expulsion of the Hyskos to Amenophis I, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 8.
- JAMESON, M. (1960) Mycenaean Religion, *Archaeology* 13, pp. 33-9.
- JENSEN, L. B. (1963) Royal Purple of Tyre, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 22, pp. 104-18.
- KANDYBA, O. (1936) S-Spiral in the Decoration of the Dniestro-Danubian Neolithic Pottery, *American Journal of Archaeology* 40, pp. 228-45.
- KANTOR, H. J. (1942) The Early Relations of Egypt with Asia, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 1, pp. 174-213.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1947a) *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium B.C.*
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1947b) The Shoulder Ornament of Near Eastern Lions, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 6, pp. 250-74, Pls. 8-11.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1950) A Further Comment on the Shoulder Ornament, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 9, pp. 55-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1952) Further Evidence for Early Mesopotamian Relations with Egypt, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 11, pp. 239-50, Pls. 20-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956) Syro-Palestinian Ivories, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 15, pp. 153-74.

- KANTOR, H. J. (1957a) Narration in Egyptian Art, *American Journal of Archaeology* 61, pp. 44-54, Pls. 11-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1957b) A "Syro-Hittite" Treasure in the Oriental Institute Museum, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 16, pp. 145-62, Pls. 20-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1960) Ivory Carving in the Mycenaean Period, *Archaeology* 13, pp. 14-25.
- KARAGEORGHIS, V. (1956) Two Mycenaean Bull-Craters in the G. G. Pierides Collection, Cyprus, *American Journal of Archaeology* 60, pp. 143-9, Pls. 56-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1957) The Mycenaean 'Window-Crater' in the British Museum, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 77, pp. 269-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1958) Myth and Epic in Mycenaean Vase Painting, *American Journal of Archaeology* 62, pp. 283-7, Pls. 98-101.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) *Cyprus*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (1972) *Acts of the First International Congress of Cypriot Studies*, Vols. I and II.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (1973) *The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean: Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium, Nicosia, 1972*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) *Cyprus Museum*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976a) Chronique des Fouilles et Découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1975, 3 Kition, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 100, pp. 875-83.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976b) *Kition*.
- KARO, G. (1930) *Die Schachtgräber von Mykenai*.
- KENNA, V.E.G. (1960) *Cretan Seals*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966a) *Die Englischen Privatsammlungen (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band VIII)*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966b) Seal Use in Ancient Crete after the Destruction of the Palaces, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 13, pp. 68-75, Pls. 1-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967a) *Die Englischen Museen II (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band VII)*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967b) An Unpublished Cypriote Cylinder, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 91, pp. 251-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967c) The Seal Use of Cyprus in the Bronze Age, I Early Stamp Seals, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 91, pp. 255-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967d) The Seal Use of Cyprus in the Bronze Age, II The Cylinder Seals, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 91, pp. 552-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968a) The Seal Use of Cyprus in the Bronze Age, III Cypriote Stamp Seals in the Late Bronze Age, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 92, pp. 142-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968b) The Kouklia Ring from Evreti, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 92, pp. 157-61.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968c) Ancient Crete and the Use of the Cylinder Seal, *American Journal of Archaeology* 72, pp. 321-30, Pls. 105-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969) *The Cretan Talismanic Stone in the Late Minoan Age*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) *Corpus of Cypriote Antiquities Vol. 3, Catalogue of Cypriote Seals of the Bronze Age in the British Museum*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1972) *Nordamerika I, New York, the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band XII)*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and THOMAS, E. (1974) *Nordamerika II Kleinere Sammlungen (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band XIII)*.
- KENYON, K. (1971) Syria and Palestine c2160-1780 B.C. The Archaeological Sites, *Cambridge Ancient History*, Ch. 21.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973a) Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age, *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Ch. 3.

- KENYON, K. (1973b) *Palestine in the Time of the Eighteenth Dynasty*, Cambridge Ancient History II, Ch. 11.
- KIDDLE, E. and BIRCH, S. (1863) *The Egyptian Relics Discovered at Thebes in the Tomb of Queen Aah-hotep*.
- KINZL, K. H. (ed.) (1977) *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory: Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr on the occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*.
- KITCHEN, K. A. (1966) Aegean Place Names in a List of Amenophis III, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 181, pp. 23-4.
- KOHLER, E. L. and RALPH, E. K. (1961) C-14 Dates for Sites in the Mediterranean Area, *American Journal of Archaeology* 65, pp. 357-67.
- KOSAY, H. Z. (1951) *Les Fouilles d'Alaca Hoyuk 1935-39*.  
(1966) *Ausgrabungen von Alaca Hoyuk 1940-48*.
- KUPPER, J.-R. (1973) Northern Mesopotamia and Syria, Cambridge Ancient History II, Ch. 1.
- LANG, M. L. (1969) *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Vol. II The Frescoes*.
- LANGE, K. (1961) *Egypt, Architecture, Sculpture, Painting*.
- LAROCHE, E. (1953) Suppiluliuma II, *Revue Archéologique* 47, pp. 70-8.
- LAVIOSA, C. (1969-70) La Marina Micenea, *Annuario Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente* 31-32, pp. 1-34.
- LAWRENCE, A. W. (1951) The Ancestry of the Minoan Palace, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 46, pp. 81-5.
- LEGRAIN, L. (1936) *Ur Excavations Vol. III Archaic Seal Impressions*.  
(1951) *Ur Excavations Vol. X Seal Cylinders*.
- LEVI, D. (1945) Gleanings from Crete, *American Journal of Archaeology* 49, pp. 270-329.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1956) The Sarcophagus of Hagia Triada Restored, *Archaeology* 9, pp. 192-9.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1964) *The Recent Excavations at Phaistos*.
- LEWY, H. (1971) Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Period, Cambridge Ancient History I, Ch. 24(b).
- LITTAEUR, M. A. (1972) The Military Use of the Chariot in the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age, *American Journal of Archaeology* 76, pp. 145-57.
- LLOYD, S. and MELLAART, J. (1956) Beycesultan Excavations Second Preliminary Report 1955, *Anatolian Studies* 6, pp. 101-35, Pls. 7-12.  
and \_\_\_\_\_ (1962-65) *Beycesultan I-II*.
- LONG, C. R. (1974) *The Ayia Triadha Sarcophagus*.
- LOUD, G. (1939) *The Megiddo Ivories*.
- LUCE, J. V. (1976) Thera and the Devastation of Minoan Crete: A New Interpretation of the Evidence, *American Journal of Archaeology* 80, pp. 9-18.
- McLEOD, W. E. (1958) An Unpublished Egyptian Composite Bow in the Brooklyn Museum, *American Journal of Archaeology* 62, pp. 397-401, Pls. 108-9.
- MacQUEEN, J. G. (1968) Geography and History in Western Asia Minor in the Second Millennium B.C., *Anatolian Studies* 18, pp. 169-85.
- MALLOWAN, M.E.L. (1971) The Early Dynastic Period in Mesopotamia, Cambridge Ancient History I, Ch. 16.
- MANATT, J. I. and TSOUNTAS, C. (1897) *The Mycenaean Age* (Reprinted 1969).

- MARINATOS, S. (1933) La Marine créto-mycénienne, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 62, pp. 170-235, Pls. 13-17.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1939) The Volcanic Destruction of Minoan Crete, *Antiquity* 13, pp. 425-39.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1951) 'Numerous Years of Joyful Life' from Mycenae, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 46, pp. 102-99.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1960) *Crete and Mycenae*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1968-76) *Excavations at Thera Vols. I-VII*.
- MARKIDES, M. (1911-12) A Mycenaean Bronze in the Cyprus Museum, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 18, pp. 95-7, Pl. 8.
- MARTIN, G. T. (1968) A New Prince of Byblos, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 27, pp. 141-2, Pl. 2.
- MARYON, H. (1961) Early Near Eastern Steel Swords, *American Journal of Archaeology* 65, pp. 173-84, Pls. 65-72.
- MATZ, F. (1956) *Le Monde Egéen, Troie-Crète-Mycènes*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1973a) The Maturity of Minoan Civilization, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 4(b).  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1973b) The Zenith of Minoan Civilization, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 12.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (1974) *Die Kretische-Mykenische Glyptik und ihre Gegenwärtigen Probleme*.
- MEGAW, A.H.S. (1967) Archaeology in Greece, 1966-67, *Archaeological Reports* 13, pp. 3-24.
- MELLAART, J. (1958) The End of the Early Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Aegean, *American Journal of Archaeology* 62, pp. 9-33, Pls. 1-3.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) Anatolian Trade with Europe and Anatolian Geography and Culture Provinces in the Late Bronze Age, *Anatolian Studies* 18, pp. 187-202.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) The Second Millennium Chronology of Beycesultan, *Anatolian Studies* 20, pp. 55-67.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1971a) Anatolia c4000-2300 B.C., *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 18.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1971b) Anatolia c2300-1750 B.C., *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 24(a).
- MELLERSH, H.E.L. (1967) *Minoan Crete*.
- MELLINK, M. J. (1956) The Royal Tombs at Alaca Huyuk and the Aegean World, in WEINBERG, S. S. (ed.), *The Aegean and the Near East*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1969) The Pratt Ivories in the Metropolitan Museum of Art - Kerma - Chronology and the Transition from Early Bronze to Middle Bronze, *American Journal of Archaeology* 73, pp. 285-7.
- MERRILLEES, R. S. (1968) *The Cypriote Bronze Age Pottery Found in Egypt*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1972a) Aegean Bronze Age Relations with Egypt, *American Journal of Archaeology* 76, pp. 281-94.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1972b) Alasia, in KARAGEORGHIS, V. (ed.), *Acts of the First International Congress of Cypriot Studies*, pp. 111-9.
- MICHALOWSKI, K. (1969) *The Art of Ancient Egypt*.
- MONTET, P. (1928) *Byblos et l'Egypte*.
- MOORTGAT, A. (1940) *Vorderasiatische Rollsiegel* (Reprinted in 1966).  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1969) *The Art of Ancient Mesopotamia*.
- MORA, C. (1974) A Hittite Seal of the British Museum, *Anatolian Studies* 24, pp. 163-7.
- MORAN, W. L. (1959) The Scandal of the "Great Sin" at Ugarit, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 18, pp. 280-1.

- MORRISON, J. S. and WILLIAMS, R. T. (1968) *Greek Oared Ships*.
- MOSCATI, S. (1963) *Historical Art in the Ancient Near East*.
- MUHL, J. D. (1972) The Land of Alashiya: References to Alashiya in the Texts of the Second Millennium B.C. and the History of Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age, in KARAGEORGHIS, V. (ed.) *The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean*, pp. 201-19.
- MURRAY, C. and WARREN, P. (1976) Po-ni-ki-jo among the Dye-plants of Minoan Crete, *Kadmos* 15, pp. 40-60.
- MYLONAS, G. E. (1937) A Mycenaean Figurine at the University of Illinois, *American Journal of Archaeology* 41, pp. 237-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1951) The Figured Mycenaean Stelai, *American Journal of Archaeology* 55, pp. 134-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1964) *Grave Circle B of Mycenae*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966) *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) *Mycenae's Last Century of Greatness*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) The Lion in Mycenaean Times, *Αρχαιολογικά Αναλεκτα εξ Αθηνων* 3, pp. 421-5.
- NA'AMAN, N. (1976) A New Look at the Chronology of Alalakh Level VII, *Anatolian Studies* 26, pp. 129-43.
- NAGEL, G. (1949) Un Détail de la Décoration d'une Tombe thébaine: Un Vase avec une Représentation de Chevaux, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 35, pp. 129-31, Pl. 12.
- NAUERT, J. P. (1965) The Hagia Triada Sarcophagus, An Iconographical Study, *Antike Kunst* 8, pp. 91-8.
- NAVILLE, E. (1898) Une Boîte de style mycénien trouvée en Egypte, *Révue Archéologique* 2, pp. 1-11.
- NEEDLER, W. (1962) A Dagger of Ahmose I, *Archaeology* 15, pp. 172-5.
- NEGBI, O. (1970) *The Hoards of Goldwork from Tell-el-'Ajjul*.
- NELSON, G. W. (1936) A Faience Rhyton from Abydos in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, *American Journal of Archaeology* 40, pp. 501-6.
- NELSON, H. H. (1943) The Naval Battle Pictured at Medinet Habu, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2, pp. 40-55.
- NICOLAOU, K. (1976) Archaeology in Cyprus 1969-76, Larnaca District, *Archaeological Reports* 22, pp. 41-4.
- NILSSON, M. P. (1927) *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1932) *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*.
- NIMS, C. F. (1973) The Transition from the Traditional to the New Style of Wall Relief under Amenhotep IV, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32, pp. 181-7.
- NOUGAYROL, J. (1955) *Mission de Ras Shamra IV Le Palais royal d'Ugarit III*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956) *Mission de Ras Shamra IX Le Palais royal d'Ugarit IV*.
- OVERBECK, J. C., and McDONALD, C. K. (1976) The Date of the Last Palace at Knossos, *American Journal of Archaeology* 80, pp. 155-64.
- PAGE, D. L. (1970) *The Santorini Volcano and the Destruction of Minoan Crete*.
- PANOFSKY, E. (1962) *Studies in Iconology*.
- PARROT, A. (1950) *Studia Mariana*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1951) Cylindre hittite nouvellement acquis (A020138), *Syria* 28, pp. 180-90, Pls. 13-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956-9) *Mission de Mari Vols. I-II*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1960) *Sumer*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1964) *Acquisitions et Inédits du Musée du Louvre, "Assiettes myceniennes"*, *Syria* 41, pp. 240-50, Pls. 15-16.

- PELTENBURG, E. J. (1972) On the Classification of Faience Vases from Late Bronze Age Cyprus, in KARAGEORGHIS, V. (ed.) *Acts of the First International Congress of Cypriot Studies I*, pp. 129-36.
- PENDLEBURY, J.D.S. (1930) *Aegyptiaca, A Catalogue of Egyptian Objects in the Aegean Area*.  
(1939) *The Archaeology of Crete*.
- PERKINS, A. (1957) Narration in Babylonian Art, *American Journal of Archaeology* 61, pp. 54-62, Pls. 17-20.
- PERNIER, L. (1935) *Il Palazzo Minoico di Festos*.  
and BANTI, L. (1951) *Il Palazzo Minoico di Festos II*.
- PERSSON, A. W. (1931) *The Royal Tombs at Dendra near Midea*.  
and FRODIN, O. (1938) *Asine, Results of the Swedish Excavations 1922-30*.  
(1942) *New Tombs at Dendra Near Midea*.
- PETRIE, W.M.F. (1914) *Amulets*.  
(1920) *Prehistoric Egypt*.
- PIERIDES, A. (1973) Observations on Some Mycenaean Ivories from Cyprus, in KARAGEORGHIS, V. (ed.), *The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean*, pp. 274-7, Pl. 35.
- PINI, I. (1970) *Iraklion Archäologisches Museum, Die Siegelabdrucke von Phästos (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band II, Teil 5)*.  
(1975) *Kleinere Griechische Sammlungen (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band V Teil I und Teil 2)*.
- PLATON, N. (1963) A New Minoan Palace, *Archaeology* 16, pp. 269-75.  
(1966) *Crete*.  
(1969) *Iraklion Archaeologisches Museum, Die Siegel der Vorpalastzeit (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band II Teil 1)*.  
(1971) *Zakros: The Discovery of a Lost Palace of Ancient Crete*.  
and TOULOUPA, E. (1964a) Oriental Seals from the Palace of Cadmus: Unique Discoveries in Boeotian Thebes, *Illustrated London News* 28 November, pp. 859-61.  
and \_\_\_\_\_ (1964b) Ivories and Linear-B from Thebes, *Illustrated London News* 5 December, pp. 896-7.
- PLATT, E. E. (1976) Triangular Jewelry Plaques, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 221, pp. 103-11.
- PLOMMER, H. (1965) A Carved Block from the Megaron of Mycenae, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 60, pp. 20-1, Pls. 56-7.
- POMERANCE, L. (1970) *The Final Collapse of Santorini (Thera) 1400 or 1200 BC?*  
(1976) The Peripatetic Santorini Tephra, *American Journal of Archaeology* 80, p. 305.
- POPHAM, M. (1963) Two Cypriot Sherds from Crete, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 58, pp. 89-93, Pls. 26-7.  
(1967) Late Minoan Pottery, A Summary, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 62, pp. 337-51, Pls. 76-90.  
(1970a) Late Minoan Chronology, *American Journal of Archaeology* 74, pp. 226-8.  
(1970b) *The Destruction of the Palace at Knossos*.  
(1976) Mycenaean-Minoan Relations between 1450 and 1400 B.C., *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 23, pp. 119-21 (Mycenaean Seminar).  
and CATLING, H. W. and E. A. (1974) Sellopoulo Tombs 3 and 4, Two Late Minoan Graves near Knossos, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 69, pp. 195-258, Pls. 33-41.

- PORADA, E. (1947) *Seal Impressions of Nuzi*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1948a) *Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in North American Collections. Vol. I. The Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1948b) The Cylinder Seals of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age, *American Journal of Archaeology* 52, pp. 178-98, Pls. 8-11.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1957) Syrian Seal Impressions on Tablets Dated in the Time of Hammurabi and Samsu-Iluna, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 16, pp. 192-7, Pls. 30-31.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1965) Cylinder Seals from Thebes; A Preliminary Report, *American Journal of Archaeology* 69, p. 173.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) On the Complexity of Style and Iconography in Some Groups of Cylinder Seals from Cyprus, in KARAGEORGHIS, V. (ed.), *The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean*, pp. 260-73, Pls. 32-4.
- POSENER, G. (1971) Syria and Palestine c2160-1780 B.C. Relations with Egypt, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 21.
- POURSAT, J.-Cl. (1970) Malia A. Quartier Mu, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 94, pp. 867-70.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) Ivoires de l'Artemision: Chypre et Délos, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique Supplément I, Etudes déliennes*, pp. 415-25.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) Notes d'Iconographie préhellénique: Dragons et Crocodiles, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 100, pp. 461-74.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1977a) Les Ivoires mycéniens.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1977b) Catalogue des Ivoires mycéniens du Musée national d'Athènes.
- POWELL, T.G.E. (1966) *Prehistoric Art*.
- PRITCHARD, J. B. (1951) Syrians as Pictured in the Paintings of the Theban Tombs, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 122, pp. 36-41.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1964-5) A Cosmopolitan Culture of the Late Bronze Age, *Expedition* 7, pp. 26-33.
- RAINEY, A. F. (1965) The Military Personnel of Ugarit, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 24, pp. 17-27.
- READ, J. G. (1970) Early Eighteenth Dynasty Chronology, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 29, pp. 1-11.
- REDFIELD, R. (1960) *The Little Community and Peasant Society and Culture*.
- REICH, J. J. (1966) Twelve New Bronze and Iron Age Seals, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 86, pp. 159-65, Pl. 10.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) The Date of the Hieroglyphic Deposit at Knossos, *American Journal of Archaeology* 74, pp. 406-8.
- RENFREW, C. (1972) *The Emergence of Civilisation. The Cyclades and the Aegean in the Third Millennium B.C.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ CANN, J. R. and DIXON, J. E. (1965) Obsidian in the Aegean, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 60, pp. 225-47, Pls. 62-3.
- RIEFSTAHL, E. (1972) An Enigmatic Faience Figurine, *Miscellanea Wilbouriana* I, pp. 137-43.
- RIEMSCHEIDER, M. (1965) *Die Welt der Hethiter*.
- RIESTERER, P. P. (1963) *Egyptian Museum Cairo Vol. I*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1965) *Egyptian Museum Cairo Vol. II*.
- RODENWALDT, G. (1912) *Tiryns, Die Fresken des Palastes*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (1927) *Die Kunst der Antike*.



- ROWTON, M. B. (1952) The Date of the Hittite Capture of Babylon, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 126, pp. 20-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970) Chronology II. Ancient Western Asia, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 6. (Reprinted 1976).
- RUTKOWSKI, B. (1964) Les Sarcophages minoens et mycéniens en dehors de la Grèce, *Archeologia* 15, pp. 153-76.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1972) *Cult Places in the Aegean World*.
- SAKELLARAKIS, J. A. (1967) Minoan Cemeteries at Arkhanes, *Archaeology* 20, pp. 276-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1972) A Mycenaean Grave Circle at Crete, *Αρχαιολογικά Αναλεκτα εξ Αθηνων* 5, pp. 415-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and KENNA, V.E.G. (1969) *Iraklion Sammlung Metaxas* (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band IV).
- SAKELLARIOU, A. (1953) La Représentation de Casque en Dents de Sanglier, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 77, pp. 46-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1958) *Les Cachets Minoens*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1964) *Die Mykenische Siegelglyptik*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1965) *Die Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel des Nationalmuseums in Athen* (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band I).
- SANDARS, N. K. (1961) The First Aegean Swords and Their Ancestry, *American Journal of Archaeology* 65, pp. 17-29, Pls. 15-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963) Later Aegean Bronze Swords, *American Journal of Archaeology* 67, pp. 117-53, Pls. 21-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) *Prehistoric Art in Europe*.
- SARIANIDI, V. I. (1971) The Lapis Lazuli Route in the Ancient East, *Archaeology* 24, pp. 12-15 (Translated by L. H. KOWALSKI).
- SASSON, J. M. (1968) Instances of Mobility among Mari Artisans, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 190, pp. 46-54.
- SÄVE-SÖDERBERGH, T. (1946) *The Navy of the Eighteenth Dynasty*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1951) The Hyksos Rule in Egypt, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 37, pp. 53-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1957) *Four Eighteenth Dynasty Tombs*.
- SAYRE, E. V. and DODSON, R. W. (1957) Neutron Activation Study of Mediterranean Potsherds, *Journal of Archaeology* 61, pp. 35-41.
- SCHACHERMEYR, F. (1967) *Agäis und Orient*.
- SCHAEFFER, C.F.A. (1936-37) Sur un Cratère mycénien de Ras Shamra, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 37, pp. 212-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1939-62) *Ugaritica* I-IV.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1948) *Stratigraphie comparée et Chronologie de l'Asie occidentale, IIIe et IIe millénaires*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1952) *Enkomi-Alasia, Nouvelles Missions en Chypre 1946-50*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1955) A Bronze Sword from Ugarit with Cartouche of Mineptah (Ras Shamra, Syria), *Antiquity* 29, pp. 226-9, Pls. 1-2.
- SCHLIEMANN, H. (1878) *Mycenae*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1886) *Tiryns*.
- SCOUFOPOULOS, N. C. (1971) *Mycenaean Citadels*.
- SEELE, K. C. (1955) King Ay and the Close of the Amarna Age, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 14, pp. 168-80.
- SEYRIG, H. (1955) Antiquités syriennes 60. Quelques cylindres orientaux, *Syria* 32, pp. 30-45, Pls. 3-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956) Cylindre représentant une Tauromachie, *Syria* 33, pp. 169-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963) Antiquités syriennes 86. Quelques cylindres syriens, *Syria* 40, pp. 253-60, Pls. 21.

- SHAPIRO, H. L. (ed.) (1960) *Man, Culture and Society*.
- SHAW, M. C. (1970) Ceiling Patterns from the Tomb of Hepzefa, *American Journal of Archaeology* 74, pp. 25-30, Pls. 5-6.
- SIMPSON, W. K. (1960) the Vessels with Engraved Designs and the Repoussé Bowl from the Tell Basta Treasure, *American Journal of Archaeology* 63, pp. 29-45, Pls. 11-14.
- SJÖQVIST, E. (1940a) *Reports on Excavations in Cyprus: Revised Reprint from the Swedish Cyprus Expedition*.  
(1940b) *Problems of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age*.
- SMITH, R. H. (1962) Near-Eastern Forerunners of the Striding Zeus, *Archaeology* 15, pp. 176-83.
- SMITH, S. (1949) *The Statue of Idri-mi*.
- SMITH, W. S. (1946) *Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom*.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1951) Paintings of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom at Bersheh, *American Journal of Archaeology* 55, pp. 321-32, Pls. 18-21A.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1958) *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1963) The Stela of Prince Wepemnofret, *Archaeology* 16, pp. 2-13.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1965) *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East*.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1969) Influence of the Middle Kingdom of Egypt in Western Asia, Especially in Byblos, *American Journal of Archaeology* 73, pp. 277-81.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1971) The Old Kingdom in Egypt and the Beginning of the First Intermediate Period, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 14.
- STARR, R.F.S. (1937, 9) *Nuzi, Vols. I-II*.
- STEINDORFF, G. and SEELE, K. C. (1942) *When Egypt Ruled the East*. (Third Edition 1963)
- STROMMINGER, E. (1964) *The Art of Mesopotamia*.
- STUBBINGS, F. H. (1951a) *Mycenaean Pottery from the Levant*.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1951b) Some Mycenaean Artists, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 46, pp. 168-76, Pls. 18-19.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1970) Chronology III. The Aegean Bronze Age, *Cambridge Ancient History* I, Ch. 6. (Reprinted 1976.)  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1972) *Prehistoric Greece*.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1973) The Rise of Mycenaean Civilization, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 14.
- STUBBINGS, F. H. (1975a) The Expansion of Mycenaean Civilization, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 22(a).  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1975b) The Recession of Mycenaean Civilization, *Cambridge Ancient History* II, Ch. 27.
- STYRENIUS, C-G. and TZEDAKIS, J. (1970) Chania: A New Minoan Centre, *Αρχαιολογικά Αναλεκτά εξ Αθηνών* 3, pp. 100-2.
- STYRENIUS, C-G. and HELLSTROMP, P. (1971) Excavations at Chania, *Αρχαιολογικά Αναλεκτά εξ Αθηνών* 4, pp. 223-4.
- SYMEONOGLOU, S. (1973) *Kadmeia I*.
- TAMVAKI, A. (1974) The Seals and Sealings from the Citadel House Area: A Study in Mycenaean Glyptic and Iconography, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 69, pp. 259-94, Pls. 42-6.
- THEOCHARIS, D. (1956) Iolkos, *Archaeology* 9, pp. 13-18.
- THOMAS, H. (1938-39) The Acropolis Treasure from Mycenae, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 39, pp. 65-87, Pls. 26-8.
- TOSI, M. and ROCCATI, A. (1972) *Stele e Altre Epigrafi di Deir el Medina*.

- TOULOUPA, E. (1964) Bericht über die Neuen Ausgrabungen in Theben, *Kadmos* 3, pp. 25-7.
- TUFNELL, O. (1956) "Hyksos" Scarabs from Canaan, *Anatolian Studies* 6, pp. 67-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1958) Lachish Vol. IV *The Bronze Age*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) Seal Impressions from Kahûn Town and Uronarti Fort, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 61, pp. 67-101.
- \_\_\_\_\_ INGE, C. H., and HARDING, L. (1940) Lachish Vol. II *The Fosse Temple*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and WARD, W. A. (1966) Relations between Byblos, Egypt and Mesopotamia at the End of the Third Millennium B.C. A Study of the Montet Jar, *Syria* 43 fasc. 3-4, pp. 165-241.
- TZEDAKIS, Y. (1973) The Late Minoan III Settlement of Kydonia, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 20, pp. 154-7.
- UPHILL, E. P. (1970) The Per Aten at Amarna, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 29, pp. 151-66, Pl. 12.
- VAN BUREN, E. D. (1933) *The Flowing Vase and the God with Streams*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1950) An Additional Note on the Hair Whirl, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 9, pp. 54-5.
- VAN DER OSTEN, H. (1926) The Snake Symbol and the Hittite Twist, *American Journal of Archaeology* 30, pp. 405-17.
- VAN EFFENTERRE, H. and M. (1972) *Cabinet des Médailles de la Bibliothèque Nationale Paris* (Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel, Band IX).
- VANEL, A. (1965) *L'Iconographie du Dieu de l'Orage*.
- VENTRIS, M. and CHADWICK, J. (1956) *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. (Second Edition 1973).
- VERCOUTTER, J. (1956) *L'Egypte et le Monde égéen préhellénique*.
- VERMEULE, E. T. (1960) The Fall of the Mycenaean Empire, *Archaeology* 13, pp. 66-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1964) *Greece in the Bronze Age*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1965) Painted Mycenaean Larnakes, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 85, pp. 123-48, Pls. 25-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) *The Art of The Shaft Graves of Mycenae*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) Toumba tou Skourou, Northwest Cyprus, *American Journal of Archaeology* 80, p. 78.
- VIEYRA, M. (1955) *Hittite Art*.
- VIROLLEAUD, C. (1957) *Mission de Ras Shamra VII Le Palais royal d'Ugarit II*.
- VITALIANO, C. J. and D. B. (1974) Volcanic Tephra on Crete, *Journal of Archaeology* 78, pp. 19-24, Pl. 5.
- VOLLGRAF-ROES, A. (1953) The Lion with Body Markings in Oriental Art, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12, pp. 40-9.
- VON MATT, L. (1968) *Ancient Crete*.
- WACE, A. J. B. (1932) *Chamber Tombs at Mycenae*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1936-37) Jericho Tomb 13, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 37, pp. 259-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1949) *Mycenae, An Archaeological History and Guide* (Reprinted 1964).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1953) Mycenae 1939-1952 Part I Preliminary Report on the Excavations of 1952, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 48, pp. 3-18, Pls. 1-11.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1954) Mycenae 1939-1953 Part I Preliminary Report on the Excavations of 1953, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 49, pp. 230-43, Pls. 31-40.

- WACE, A.J.B. (1956) Mycenae 1939-55: Part I Preliminary Report on the Excavations of 1955, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 51, pp. 103-22, Pls. 17-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and PORADA, E. (1957) Mycenae 1939-1956, 1957 Part II A Faience Cylinder, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 52, pp. 197-204, Pls. 36-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and BLEGEN, C. W. (1963) Pottery as Evidence for Trade and Colonization in the Aegean Bronze Age, *Klio* 32, pp. 131-41, Pls. 1-4.
- WADE-GERY, H. T. (1948) What Happened at Pylos? *American Journal of Archaeology* 52, pp. 115-18.
- WAINWRIGHT, G. A. (1931) Keftiu: Crete or Cilicia? *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 51, pp. 1-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1939) Some Sea-Peoples and Others in the Hittite Archives, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 25, pp. 148-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1952) Asiatic Keftiu, *American Journal of Archaeology* 56, pp. 196-212.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1954) Keftiu and Karamania (Asia Minor), *Anatolian Studies* 4, pp. 33-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956a) The Cappadocian Symbol, *Anatolian Studies* 6, pp. 137-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1956b) The Teresh, the Etruscans and Asia Minor, *Anatolian Studies* 6, pp. 197-203.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1960) Menephtah's Aid to the Hittites, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 46, pp. 24-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1961) Some Sea-Peoples, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 47, pp. 71-90, Pl. 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1962) The Meshwesh, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 48, pp. 89-99.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1964) Shekelesh or Shasu? *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 50, pp. 40-6.
- WALBERG, G. (1976) *Kamares: A Study of the Character of Palatial Middle Minoan Pottery.*
- WARD, W. A. (1970) The Origin of Egyptian Design-Amulets ('Button Seals'), *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56, pp. 65-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) *Egypt and the East Mediterranean World 2200-1900 B.C.*
- WARREN, P. (1967) A Stone Vase Maker's Workshop in the Palace at Knossos, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 62, pp. 195-202, Pl. 40.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969a) *Minoan Stone Vases.*
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969b) The Origins of the Minoans, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 16, pp. 156-7 (Proceedings of the British Association for Mycenaean Studies).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1972a) *Myrtos, An Early Bronze Age Settlement in Crete.*
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1972b) Knossos and the Greek Mainland in the Third Millennium B.C., *Αρχαιολογικά Αναλεκτά ἐξ Αθηνών* 5, pp. 392-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) *The Aegean Civilizations.*
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) Did Papyrus Grow in the Aegean? *Αρχαιολογικά Αναλεκτά ἐξ Αθηνών* 7, pp. 89-95.
- WATERHOUSE, H. (1974) Priest-kings? *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 21, pp. 153-5 (Mycenaean Seminar).
- WEINBERG, S. S. (1951) Neolithic Figurines and Aegean Interrelations, *American Journal of Archaeology* 55, pp. 121-33, Pls. 1-3.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (1956) *The Aegean and the Near East.*

- WENTE, E. F. (1975) Tuthmose III's Accession and the Beginning of the New Kingdom, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 34, pp. 265-72.
- WESTENDORF, W. (1968) *Ancient Egypt*.
- WIENCKE, M. H. (1969a) Further Seals and Sealings from Lerna, *Hesperia* 38, pp. 500-21, Pls. 125-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969b) The Beulah H. Emmet Collection of Minoan Seals, *American Journal of Archaeology* 73, pp. 33-8, Pls. 11-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) Clay Sealings from Shechem, the Sudan, and the Aegean, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 35, pp. 127-30.
- WILSON, A. L. (1976) The Presence in Crete of Volcanic Ash from Thera, *American Journal of Archaeology* 80, pp. 419-20.
- WILSON, J. A. (1947) The Artist of the Egyptian Old Kingdom, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 6, pp. 231-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) Akh-en-aton and Nefert-iti, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32, pp. 235-41.
- WISEMAN, D. J. (1953) *The Alalakh Tablets*.
- WOOLLEY, C. L. (1921) *Charchemish Part II The Town Defences*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1934) *Ur Excavations Vol. II The Royal Cemetery*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1955) *Alalakh*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and BARNETT, R. D. (1952) *Carchemish Part III The Excavations in the Inner Town and the Hittite Inscriptions*.
- XANTHOUDIDES, S. (1924) *The Vaulted Tombs of Mesara* (Republished 1971).
- YADIN, Y. (1958-61) *Hazor I-IV*.
- YAKAR, J. (1974) The Twin Shrines of Beycesultan, *Anatolian Studies* 24, pp. 151-61.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) Hittite Involvement in Western Anatolia, *Anatolian Studies* 26, pp. 117-28.
- YOUNGER, J. G. (1973) The Vaphio Gems: A Reconsideration of the Find Spots, *American Journal of Archaeology* 77, pp. 338-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976) Bronze Age Representations of Aegean Bull-Leaping, *American Journal of Archaeology* 80, pp. 125-37.
- ZERVOS, C. (1956) *L'Art de la Crète*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1957) *L'Art des Cyclades*.